DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 085 568 CE 000 754

AUTHOR	McLean, Gary N.
TITLE	Attitudes of Minnesota Office and Distributive Education Coordinators Toward Vocational Student Organizations.
INSTITUTION	Delta Pi Epsilon, Minneapolis, Minn. Phi Chapter.
PUB DATE	Mar 73
NOTE	80p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Phi Chapter, Delta Pi Epsilon, 254 Peik Hall, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota ($2.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Cocurricular Activities; *Distributive Education; Educational Coordination; *Faculty Advisors; Inservice Teacher Education; *Office Occupations Education; Program Costs; Program Development; Questionnaires; *Student Organizations; Teaching Skills; *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS	Minnesota

ABSTRACT

Since limited research has been reported on the use of organizations to supplement cooperative office education, it was the purpose of this study to determine the characteristics of vocational student organizations and advisors and to determine the attitudes of advisors to office and distributive education vocational student organizations in Minnesota. An attitudinal questionnaire was developed and sent to all Minnesota secondary school office and distributive education coordinators to gather information pertaining to coordinator characteristics; school enrollment; program characteristics; organizational age, income, membership policies, activities, and objectives; advisor compensation and role; relationship of organization to classroom; and adequacy of teacher education programs. Answers from the 82 percent of questionnaires returned are tabulated and discussed. Some conclusions were that teacher education institutions need to take more active roles in preparing coordinators as advisors, women need to be recruited as coordinators, and that suggested guidelines be set up for organizations. Further areas of concern indicated were the student population to be served, leadership conferences, in-service coordinator training, and sources of funds. (EA)

ED 085568

ATTITUDES OF MINNESOTA OFFICE AND DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION COORDINATORS TOWARD VOCATIONAL STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS

By

Gary Neil McLean, Ed.D.
Associate Professor of Business Education
University of Minneosta

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

The research reported herein was sponsored by Phi Chapter of Delta Pi Epsilon, University of Minnesota. The points of view or opinions expressed, however, are those of the author. Publication of this monograph by Phi Chapter does not necessarily constitute endorsement of the ideas expressed. Additional copies are available at $2.00.

Phi Chapter, Delta Pi Epsilon
254 Peik Hall
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

March, 1973

CE 000 754

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author is indebted to many people for making the publication of this monograph possible. Obviously, without the high response rate to the questionnaire by the coordinators, the generalizability of the data obtained would have been severely limited. Likewise, it was only through the financial assistance of Phi Chapter of Delta Pi Epsilon at the University of Minnesota that the questionnaires were printed and distributed and the monograph printed. Additional financial support was provided by the University of Minnesota for the computer analysis of the data.

The questionnaire used in this study was developed by a research sub-committee of Phi Chapter, Delta Pi Epsilon, while the author was chairman of that sub-committee. Other members included: Ruth Delorey, John Lobben, Earl Halvas, and Gerald Collard. Appreciation is also expressed to the members of the 1970 Executive Committee of Phi Chapter for their critical review of the questionnaire and the general research design. The Business and Office Education and Distributive Education units of the Vocational Division of the Minnesota State Department of Education provided lists of all coordinators in their respective fields.

The author also wishes to express thanks to Sandy Brady and Paul Kim, Research Fellows, and Bwaghan Ghambhir, Research Assistant in Business Education at the University of Minnesota, for their assistance in keypunching the data and assisting in computer analysis. Appreciation is extended to Warren G. Meyer, Professor of Distributive Education, and Charles R. Hopkins, Associate Professor of Business Education at the University of Minnesota, for their critical review of the final draft of the monograph. Kay Dressler and Elaine Ronken were responsible for typing the drafts and final copy.

It is the author's hope that the cumulative efforts of these people have been successful in providing some answers to the complex question of the role of vocational student organizations in developing vocational competency.

Gary N. McLean

March, 1973

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	i
INTRODUCTION	1
Application of the Findings	1
REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH	2
Attitudes of DE Coordinators and Teacher-Educators Compared	2
Non-Participating Distributive Education Coordinators	5
Attitudes of Minnesota Vocational Coordinators	6
Attitudes of Students Toward Vocational Student Organizations	7
A Comparison of Coordinators' and Students' Attitudes Toward Vocational Student Organizations	8
Summary	9
PROCEDURES	10
Development of the Survey Instrument	10
Population	10
Analysis of Data	11
Summary	12
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	12
Characteristics of the Coordinators	13
Age	13
Sex	14
Educational Attainment	15
Major Field	16
Institutions where Vocational Education Courses were Taken	17
Years of Teaching Experience	18
Enrollment in the Responding Schools	19
Characteristics of the Cooperative Program	20
Number of Seniors in Cooperative Programs	20
Age of Cooperative Programs	20
Age of Vocational Student Organizations	21
Compensation Received by Advisor	21

TABLE OF CONTENTS (continued)

Page

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION (continued) . . . . . .

Income of Vocational Youth Organizations 21

Average Yearly Income 23
Source of Support 23

Membership Policies 25

Mandatory Membership 26
Membership Qualifications 26

Relationship of Youth Organization to Classroom 27

Classroom Time Used 28
Percentage of Grade Given 28

Role of the Advisor 29
Adequacy of Teacher Education Programs 31
Youth Organization Activities 32
Youth Organization Objectives 39

Differences Based on Age 40
Differences Based on Sex 40
Differences Based on Years of Teaching Experience . . . 40
Differences Based on Program Areas 40
Differences Based on Enrollment 40

Summary 40
Conclusions and Recommendations 42

REFERENCES 46

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Number of Classroom Hours Per Week Used by Advisors for Vocational Student Organization Activities 4

Table 2: Percent of Grade Assigned to Vocational Youth Organization Activities by Advisors 4

Table 3: Self-Perceived Role of DECA Advisor 5

Table 4: Response to Questionnaire 11

Table 5: Age Distribution of Coordinators 13

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

		Page
Table 6:	Sex Distribution	14
Table 7:	Educational Attainment	15
Table 8:	Major Field of Highest Degree	16
Table 9:	Institution at Which Vocational Education Courses Taken	17
Table 10:	Number of Years of Teaching Experience	18
Table 11:	Enrollment in Schools with Cooperative Education Programs	19
Table 12:	Number of Seniors in Cooperative Programs	20
Table 13:	Age of Cooperative Programs	21
Table 14:	Years of Existence of Vocational Youth Organizations	22
Table 15:	Compensation Received by Youth Organization Advisor	22
Table 16:	Average Yearly Income of the Youth Organization	23
Table 17:	Source of Support for Vocational Youth Organizations	24
Table 18:	Coordinators' Policies on Required Membership	26
Table 19:	Membership Qualification in Vocational Youth Organization	27
Table 20:	Classroom Time Used for Vocational Youth Activities	28
Table 21:	Percent of Grade Given for Participation in Vocational Youth Activities	29
Table 22:	Coordinators' Perceived Role as Advisor	30
Table 23:	Coordinators' Evaluation of Adequacy of Teacher Education Program in Preparation to be an Advisor	31
Table 24:	Major Activities of Vocational Youth Organizations	33
Table 25:	Major Activities Judged to be of "Great Value"	33
Table 26:	Significant Chi Squares for Participation in, and Value of, Vocational Youth Organization Activities, Based on Age of Respondent	34

LIST OF TABLES (continued)

Page

Table 27: Significant Chi Squares for Participation in, and Value of, Vocational Youth Organization Activities, Based on Sex of Respondent 35

Table 28: Significant Chi Squares for Participation in, and Value of, Vocational Youth Organization Activities, Based on Years of Teaching Experience 36

Table 29: Significant Chi Squares for Participation in, and Value of, Vocational Youth Organization Activities, Based on Program Areas 37

Table 30: Significant Chi Squares for Participation in, and Value of, Vocational Youth Organization Activities, Based on Enrollment in the School (Grades 10-12) . . . 38

Table 31: Major Objectives of Vocational Youth Organizations Judged to be of "Great Value" 39

Table 32: Frequencies and Percentages for All Respondents on Objectives 47

Table 33: Frequencies and Percentages for All Respondents on Activities 48

Table 34: Frequencies and Percentages for Office Education Coordinators on Objectives 50

Table 35: Frequencies and Percentages for Office Education Coordinators on Activities 51

Table 36: Frequencies and Percentages for Distributive Education Coordinators on Objectives 53

Table 37: Frequencies and Percentages for Distributive Education Coordinators on Activities 54

Table 38: Frequencies and Percentages for Combined Programs Coordinators on Objectives 56

Table 39: Frequencies and Percentages for Combined Programs Coordinators on Activities 57

Table 40: Chi Square Values Computed Based on Five Stratification Categories 59

ATTITUDES OF MINNESOTA OFFICE AND DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION COORDINATORS TOWARD VOCATIONAL STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS

In its Seventh Annual Report to the President, the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education (1972) underscored the importance of vocational student organizations as an integral part of vocational education. It called on the President and Congress to provide sufficient financial support to make the organizations functional throughout all levels of vocational education.

The perceived importance of vocational youth organizations was also evident from a covering letter accompanying the Minnesota State Department of Education (1971) "Policies for Youth Organizations in Vocational-Technical Education." This letter stated: "Vocational youth organizations have proven to be probably the most vital component in vocational programs." The guidelines accompanying this letter are designed to encourage the incorporation of vocational student organizations into all vocational education programs. For example, the first guideline states: "Youth organizations shall be conducted as integral parts of vocational education instructional programs in public schools and shall complement and enrich instruction."

In spite of the positive support given to vocational student organizations at both the State and National level in these two statements, vocational student organizations have not been proven to be beneficial to students enrolled in vocational education programs. While many testimonies are available on an individual level from both advisors and students who have been active in such organizations, Keller (1971, p. 124) states that:

> Little research has been reported on the use of organizations to supplement Cooperative Office Education. Groves (1967) found that the majority of vocational education programs for the students with special needs do not have a youth organization associated with them.

Somewhat more research has been conducted in vocational education programs other than Office Education, particularly in Distributive Education, but the findings and samples used are either not comprehensive, are out-of-date, or do not permit analysis by program area. This current study, then, was designed to determine the characteristics of vocational student organizations and advisors, as well as to determine the attitudes of advisors to Office and Distributive Education vocational student organizations in Minnesota.

Application of the Findings

The study was designed to enable local coordinators to share their opinions and attitudes on vocational student organizations with colleagues

throughout the State of Minnesota. Copies of the study are being distributed to the Minnesota State supervisors in the respective vocational fields so that suggested changes in State guidelines might be considered. In addition, teacher education programs can use the results of the study to develop and/or to revise courses on vocational student organizations. On a broader scale, the national offices of the major vocational student organizations are being sent copies of this report for possible inclusion of the report's recommendations in National guidelines. Finally, the report will be available to coordinators and school district officials for assistance in the development and operation of local youth organizations.

REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH

As indicated above, one of the major reasons for undertaking this research was the fact that little research has been undertaken in the past. However, three studies related to the attitudes of vocational student organization advisors, one study related to the attitudes of Distributive Education students toward vocational student organizations, and one study comparing the attitudes of students and coordinators were located and will be reviewed in this section. No research was located that dealt with the attitudes of Office Education coordinators. Thus, the review of this literature will be limited to research completed in the Distributive Education area or across all vocational programs.

Attitudes of DE Coordinators and Teacher-Educators Compared

A major study was completed by Larry Krier (1971) as a master's paper. The purpose of his study was to determine any differences existing, if any, between the views of Distributive Education teacher-educators and teacher-coordinators with regard to DECA (Distributive Education Clubs of America). His findings were based on a national sample of Distributive Education teacher-educators and teacher-coordinators in the United States. A summary of his findings having implications for comparison with the results of the current study follows:

1. Fifty-nine percent of the advisors considered club participation in the total grade received by the student. Fifty-four percent of the teacher-educators thought that club participation should be considered in determining final grades in Distributive Education.

2. Sixty-five percent of the advisors made membership mandatory for their students. Sixty-one percent of teacher-educators believed that membership should be mandatory.

3. Ninety percent of the advisors, compared with 97 percent of the teacher-educators, believed that DECA improves student motivation.

4. Eighty-four percent of the advisors, compared with 95 percent of the teacher-educators, believed that DECA improves employer interest in the cooperative program.

The above points are areas in which advisors and teacher-educators basically had similar outlooks. The following points were those in which some discrepancy existed between teacher-educators and advisors:

1. Ninety-two percent of DECA advisors did not receive any salary for their advisory duties. However, 57 percent thought that they should be paid, compared with 77 percent of the teacher-educators. Of those advisors indicating that they thought they should be paid for their advisory duties, 67 percent thought that the salary should be $500 or more per year.

2. Sixty-eight percent of the advisors, compared with 86 percent of the teacher-educators, thought that DECA should be considered as an integral part of the program and not an extracurricular activity.

3. Fifty-three percent of teacher-educators, compared with 72 percent of advisors, thought that state leadership conferences have much educational value for the students.

4. Only 33 percent of teacher-educators, compared with 62 percent of advisors, thought that membership in DECA should be limited to juniors and seniors.

5. Forty-eight percent of teacher-educators, compared with 81 percent of advisors, thought that a course entitled "Youth Organizations" should be offered in a teacher education program.

6. The purposes of DECA perceived to be of great value by teacher-educators were: leadership development (68 percent) and create prestige and recognition (51 percent). These were the only two of the several items listed receiving majority agreement. According to the advisors, the purposes receiving majority agreement were: state and national competitive events (58 percent), leadership development (55 percent), and competition (52 percent).

7. The top five activities chosen by teacher-educators were:

   Hold an employer-employee banquet (88 percent)
   Subscribe to The Distributor (82 percent)
   Participate in National DECA Month (81 percent)
   Present appreciation awards to sponsors (77 percent)
   Select an outstanding DE student (65 percent)

   According to the advisors, the top activities were:

   Subscribe to The Distributor (98 percent)
   Hold an employer-employee banquet (85 percent)
   Participate in National DECA Month (79 percent)
   Present appreciation awards to sponsors (76 percent)
   Select an outstanding DE student (69 percent)

The following findings are independent of a comparison between the advisors and the teacher-educators but are related to the findings of the current study:

1. The following table indicates the number of hours spent during school hours on vocational student organization activities:

TABLE 1
Number of Classroom Hours Per Week Used by Advisors for Vocational Student Organization Activities[a]

Number of Hours	Number	Percent
0	12	6.1
1	68	35.0
2	52	26.8
3	20	10.3
More than 3	42	21.6
Total	194	99.8

[a]Krier (1971, p. 44)

2. The percentage of total grade that advisors felt should be allocated to vocational youth organization activities is shown in Table 2 below:

TABLE 2
Percent of Grade Assigned to Vocational Youth Organization Activities by Advisors[a]

Percent of Grade	Number*	Percent
1-10	90	46.6
11-20	60	30.8
21-30	27	14.1
31-40	10	5.0
41-50	7	3.3
Over 50	0	0.0
Total	194	99.8

[a]Krier (1971, p. 48)

***The numbers have been changed from the original so that they correctly total 194. Percents were applied to the total of 194.**

3. The self-perceived role of the teacher-coordinators in the vocational youth organization is shown in Table 3, below:

TABLE 3
Self-Perceived Role of DECA Advisor[a]

Advisor's Role	Number	Percent
Available when asked	17	8.7
Volunteer advice when needed	76	39.1
Participate equally with students	46	23.7
Provide definite leadership	52	26.8
Other	3	1.5
Total	194	99.8

[a]Krier (1971, p. 69)

Many of the questions used by Krier were employed in the questionnaire of the current study. Comparisons between Krier's findings and the findings of the current study will provide an indication of the differences in attitudes between Minnesota and National Distributive Education advisors.

Non-Participating Distributive Education Coordinators

In a master's study conducted at the University of Minnesota, Gerald Collard (1970) interviewed all Distributive Education coordinators in the State of Minnesota whose schools did not have a DECA organization. The purpose of his study was to determine the factors influencing their non-participation.

A summary of his findings follows:

1. The two major reasons for non-participation were: lack of student motivation and lack of funds to support club. Each of these reasons was selected by six of the 13 coordinators interviewed. Other factors mentioned three times included: not enough time for club activities, DECA not adequate for inner-city school youth, lack of support from the administration for the club, and new Distributive Education programs with a club not yet developed.

2. All coordinators agreed that the DECA youth organization did have a place in the Distributive Education program,

but, at the same time, they felt that it was not appropriate for their Distributive Education program.

3. When asked what improvements could be made in the State of Minnesota, five coordinators suggested that the State Department provide reimbursement for students participating in youth organizations; four coordinators thought there was a need to improve club activities so that all students, rather than just a few, could be involved. Other suggested improvements made by at least two coordinators included: have regional meetings, improve the organization of state leadership conferences, take competitive nature out of DECA, and change philosophy of DECA to today's changing youth.

Comparing the attitudes of these non-participants with the Distributive Education coordinators who responded in the present study will provide information as to whether or not vocational youth organization advisors, even while participating in the organization, have some of the same concerns as their non-participating colleagues.

Attitudes of Minnesota Vocational Coordinators

Under the direction of Gene Nardina (1970), the Minnesota Vocational Coordinators Association undertook a survey of its members regarding their attitudes toward a selected number of questions on vocational youth activities. The 61 percent return consisted of mostly Distributive Education coordinators. One of the difficulties in interpreting the results of this study is that there is no breakdown in the analysis as to the field represented in the selections. An additional difficulty is that the sample selection was biased in that only members of the association were included. This automatically eliminated a large number of coordinators and advisors to vocational student organizations who were not members of the association.

However, a summary of the findings of this study is listed below. Again, many of the questions were similar to questions asked in the Krier study and in the current study:

1. Seven percent of the advisors responding received extra pay ranging from $4 per hour to $320 per year.

2. Fifty-four percent of advisors responding had mandatory club membership policies.

3. The amount of school time used per week for club activities was broken down as follows:

0 hours	-	25%
1 hour	-	60%
2 hours	-	10%
3 hours	-	4%

4. Thirty-seven percent of advisors responding related club participation to the overall grade.

5. Twenty-seven percent of advisors responding permitted club functions and meetings without club coordinator attendance.

6. Fifty-nine percent thought that cooperative coordinators should be paid for their advisory activities.

7. Sixty-six percent of advisors responding felt that the club activities should be an integral part of the coop program rather than an extracurricular activity.

Attitudes of Students Toward Vocational Student Organizations

A small part of Bicanich's (1964) study dealt with the attitudes of Distributive Education students toward vocational student organizations. His findings are reported in summary form in the following points:

1. Seventy-four percent of the responding students were in schools with DECA programs; 26 percent were not.

2. Of those students with an organization available to them, 93 percent of the students belonged to the State MDVC (Minnesota Diversified Vocations Club) and 59 percent belonged to National DECA.

3. Of those students with an organization available to them, 73 percent participated in local activities, 46 percent participated in regional activities, and 42 percent in state activities.

4. Eleven percent of students with an organization available to them felt that the organization was of "no value" to the Distributive Education program, while 36 percent thought it was of "great value."

5. Twenty percent of students with an organization available to them felt that the activities were of no personal benefit at all, while 24 percent felt they had benefitted a great deal.

6. Eighty-eight percent of the students who had a chapter available to them said that they would enroll in Distributive Education if they had the year to do over again; only 79 percent of those without the organization made the same statement.

A Comparison of Coordinators' and Students' Attitudes Toward Vocational Student Organizations

Cottrell's (1966) study surveyed both coordinators and students in Distributive Education programs in Minnesota. As his findings were quite comprehensive, only a summary will be presented here:

1. Twenty-three percent of the responding students had no regular participation in vocational student organizations.

2. While no percentages were computed, the following activities are listed in rank-order being most liked by students. Items selected by 10 or more students only are listed. The top three items are listed for the coordinators:

   a) Male-Urban students selected breakfasts, employer-employee banquets, leadership conferences, and social activities.
   b) Male-Rural students selected social activities, leadership conferences, meetings, and fund-raising.
   c) Female-Urban students selected leadership conferences, fund-raising, field trips, and employer-employee banquets.
   d) Female-Rural students selected social activities, fund-raising, and leadership conferences.
   e) Urban coordinators selected leadership conferences, competitive events, and field trips.
   f) Rural coordinators selected social activities, leadership conferences, and employer-employee banquets.

3. Both Rural and Urban coordinators selected employer-employee banquets as being most beneficial to the coordinators.

4. Activities selected as activities least liked by students follow. Activities are included only if selected by 10 or more students. The top activity only is listed for the coordinators:

   a) Male-Urban students least liked breakfast meetings.
   b) Male-Rural students least liked meetings, fund-raising, and dues.
   c) No activity was selected by 10 or more females in either Rural or Urban group.
   d) Urban coordinators selected meetings.
   e) Rural coordinators selected fund-raising.

5. The three major reasons given by non-participating students for their lack of involvement, in rank were: too far from other schools, too busy, and no interest.

6. Of 10 options provided, the coordinators top 4 choices of the purposes of DECA were as follows:

   a) Urban--social and recreational, citizenship, responsibility, and respect for education.
   b) Rural--responsibility, respect for education, leadership, and citizenship.

7. Asked to indicate the educational value of DECA the Urban coordinators' responses ranged about equally from "little" to "much," while Rural coordinators selected only "some" and "much," with twice as many selecting the higher category.

8. Both Urban and Rural coordinators selected "provide definite leadership" as their interpretation of their role in the organization. However, choices were distributed among all five options, and several indicated a combination of roles.

9. Urban coordinators almost unanimously required membership in the vocational youth organization. While the majority of Rural coordinators also required membership, several indicated that they used "active encouragement."

10. Urban coordinators used an average of 2.7 hours of classroom time per month for vocational youth organization activities compared with 4.5 hours by Rural coordinators.

Summary

No research was located on vocational student organizations in Office Education. The research that has been conducted on Distributive Education coordinators and vocational education coordinators in general reveals that there is considerable disagreement on several factors of vocational student organizations. These factors include the purpose of the vocational student organization, appropriate activities, the role of the advisor, the role of the vocational student organization in the vocational education program of the student, reimbursement to be received by the advisor, and the target population for vocational student organizations. The findings of the research in these areas have been presented and will permit later comparison with the results of the current study investigating the attitudes of Minnesota Office and Distributive Education vocational student organization advisors.

PROCEDURES

The discussion that follows presents the procedures for the current study and includes a description of: a) the development of the survey instrument, b) sampling procedures, and c) analysis of the data.

Development of the Survey Instrument

In developing the questionnaire to be used in the study, the Phi Chapter, Delta Pi Epsilon, research committee first listed all of the major areas for which information was desired. The Krier study (1971) was then consulted so that questions used in that study that were pertinent to the areas of concern in the current study might be used. With considerable revision, a number of questions used by Krier were incorporated into the questionnaire. In addition, a number of additional questions were added, based on the objectives of the research committee.

The questionnaire was then administered to a graduate vocational education class taught by the author of this monograph. Direct comments made by the students and an examination of their responses for inconsistencies and possible misinterpretations led to a number of revisions of the questionnaire. Based on this input, the questionnaire was revised and presented to the executive committee of the Phi Chapter, Delta Pi Epsilon. The committee examined the questionnaire carefully, making additional suggestions for change. These changes were made, and the questionnaire was duplicated for distribution to the population. The questionnaire thus developed is shown in the Appendix as Figure 1.

Population

A list of all Minnesota secondary school Office and Distributive Education coordinators was obtained from the respective State supervisors. It was decided that, rather than sample from the list, the questionnaire would be sent to each of the coordinators. As can be seen in Table 4 on page 11, a total of 190 questionnaires were sent, with 156 or 82 percent returned.

The initial questionnaire was sent to each coordinator on April 19, 1971, accompanied by a cover letter (See Appendix, Figure 2). Two weeks after this date, a follow-up letter and an additional copy of the questionnaire were sent to all coordinators who had not responded to the original mailing. As a questionnaire was returned, the coordinator's name was checked off the master list, and the cover sheet giving information on the coordinator's name and school was discarded to insure anonymity of questionnaire responses.

While there were 156 returns, not all returns were usable for all questions on the questionnaire. A few questionnaires were returned, for example, marked "no longer coordinator" or indicating that the person was now coordinating in some field other than Office or Distributive Education.

TABLE 4

Response to Questionnaire

Item	Program Area		Total
	OE	DE	
Number of Questionnaires Sent	60	130	190
Number of Questionnaires Returned	51	105	156
Return Ratio	85%	81%	82%

In addition, some respondents left some questions blank, as they were not vocational student organization advisors and they did not feel qualified to answer the question. This was particularly true in the Distributive Education field where it was fairly common to have two coordinators in one school with only one of the coordinators designated as the youth group advisor. Thus, in the analysis of the data, the number of responses for each question may vary considerably.

The analysis used all respondents if the question was one of attitude, but used only one respondent per program area per school when the question was a factual one, such as the size of the program, budget, and so on. The coordinator used in such analyses was the one designated as advisor, or if both coordinators indicated they were an advisor, one respondent was selected at random. This was necessary as the answers, even on factual questions, differed slightly between coordinators in schools with two coordinators. Thus, it is necessary in reading the Results section to note from the footnotes whether all respondents were included in the analysis or whether the respondents were chosen so that there was no more than one advisor per school.

Analysis of Data

The questionnaire responses were keypunched and analysed by computer. The basic analysis used was a frequency distribution with percentages. Each analysis was completed according to program area so that each analysis shows data by Office Education responses; by Distributive Education responses; by what is called in this paper Combined Programs responses, in which the coordinator indicated that he was responsible for both Business and Distributive Education programs in his school; and finally by total across all three areas.

While there are some technical objections to its use in this study, Chi Square analysis was also applied to each question. Two basic assumptions have been violated in the use of this analysis: one is the fact that a total population was included in the study so that sampling was not a part of the study. Therefore, technically, a statistic cannot be determined, as the sample in this case is the total population. However, 100 percent of the population did not respond, and Chi Square was used to indicate whether in the total population the differences achieved from the sampling returning their questionnaires was significant.

This design violates a second assumption, and that is that there is no assurance that the non-respondents in this case would have responded in the same way as did the respondents. Using the sample returned to generalize through the total population implies that the non-respondents would have answered in the same way as did the respondents. It was decided, however, to use this statistic, indicating the weaknesses in its use, so that the reader might be able to focus on those areas in which the greatest differences do exist.

The Chi Square analysis was undertaken using five categories: age (divided into 30 and under, 31-40, and 41 and over), sex, number of years of teaching experience (divided into 5 years and less, 6-14 years, and 15 and over), program area, and enrollment in school (stratified by 500 and under, 501-1000, and 1001 and over).

Summary

The procedures used in this study included the development of an instrument to survey the attitudes of Minnesota Secondary School Office and Distributive Education coordinators toward vocational student organizations, the testing and rewriting of the instrument to insure reliability, the development of a cover letter sent to all Minnesota Secondary School Office and Distributive Education coordinators, and the compiling of the responses to that questionnaire by frequency, by percentage of responses according to program area and across program areas, and a Chi Square analysis for differences in responses based on age, sex, years of teaching experience, program area, and enrollment in school.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Summary tables and discussion of the results are presented in this section pertaining to the following categories: a) characteristics of the coordinators, b) enrollment in the responding schools, c) characteristics of the cooperative programs, d) age of vocational youth organization, e) compensation received by advisor, f) income of vocational youth organization, g) membership policies, h) relationship of youth organization to classroom, i) role of the advisor, j) adequacy of teacher education programs, k) youth organization activities, and l) youth organization objectives.

Complete frequency and percentage tables, as well as all Chi Square values computed, are shown in Tables 32 to 39 in the Appendix. The frequency tables are shown by: total respondents, Office Education respondents, Distributive Education respondents, and respondents representing both Office and Distributive Education. Where no mention is made in the discussion of Chi Square values, no significant Chi Squares were computed.

Characteristics of the Coordinators

The data collected permit generalizations about the following characteristics of coordinators: age, sex, educational attainment, major field, institution at which the majority of vocational education courses were taken, and years of teaching experience.

Age. Table 5 shows the distribution of ages of the responding coordinators.

TABLE 5

Age Distribution of Coordinators*

Age	Program Area			Total
	OE	DE	Combined Programs	
Under 30	6 (13%)	24 (27%)	6 (29%)	36 (23%)
30-40	16 (35%)	36 (38%)	9 (42%)	61 (40%)
Over 40	24 (52%)	28 (35%)	6 (29%)	58 (37%)
Median	40 years	36 years	33 years	37 years

*Some schools have more than one coordinator in a program area. This table represents the responses of all coordinators.

Quite evidently, more Distributive Education coordinators are in the under 30 category than are Office Education coordinators, and conversely, Office Coordinators are more frequently in the over 40 category than are the Distributive Education coordinators.

A number of possible explanations are available. One possibility is the difference in certification requirements that have existed in Minnesota. Until recently, two years of teaching experience were required for certification as an Office Education coordinator. On the other hand,

Distributive Education coordinators could be certified immediately upon graduation. It is possible, therefore, that by the time an Office Education teacher had acquired two years of teaching experience, others in the department would have moved into the only available coordinator's position. Distributive Education coordinators, on the other hand, could seek a coordinator's position on initial employment.

In addition, these figures may represent the fact that Distributive Education has grown more rapidly in recent years than has Office Education. With a newly expanding field, many new people are attracted to it and this could result in the higher percentage of those in the under 30 category for Distributive Education.

Sex. Distribution of sex of the responding coordinators is shown in Table 6.

TABLE 6

Sex Distribution*

Sex	Program Area			Total
	OE	DE	Combined Programs	
Male	31 (65%)	83 (93%)	21 (100%)	135 (86%)
Female	17 (35%)	6 (7%)		23 (14%)
Total	48 (30%)	89 (56%)	21 (14%)	158 (100%)

*Some schools have more than one coordinator in a program area. This table represents the responses of all coordinators.

There are very obvious differences in sex distribution among the three sub-groups. The coordinators of both Office and Distributive Education are all male. Distributive Education coordinators are almost all male. While more females are represented in the Office Education field, again a large number are male.

Explanations for the shortage of females in coordinator positions are varied. The larger number of females in the Office Education area may reflect the stereotype that Office Education is for females, not males. A more interesting observation from these data, however, is the fact that even in a field very heavily associated with female occupations, a large majority of coordinators are male. This may reflect the tendency of school

systems to place males rather than females in positions other than classroom teaching; it might be that male teachers stay in a school system longer than females do and thus are better able to move into a coordinator's position; because of their other roles as wives and mothers, women may find it difficult to have the related work experience necessary for certification; and it may point to a difference in personality traits developed under societal pressures, i.e., men may be more aggressive than women and thus move to positions in which such aggressiveness is necessary rather than stay in the classroom as women may choose.

The total domination of male coordinators in the Combined Programs may occur because men are more mobile than women and thus are better able to move to areas where Combined Programs are more likely to exist.

Educational Attainment. On the whole, as shown in Table 7, coordinators in Combined Programs tend not to have education beyond the Bachelor's degree to the same extent as do Office and Distributive Education coordinators. Likewise, there is greater likelihood that an Office Education coordinator will have a Master's degree or beyond (56%) than a Distributive Education coordinator (33%).

TABLE 7

Educational Attainment*

Degree	Program Area			Total
	OE	DE	Combined Programs	
B.S.	10 (21%)	37 (42%)	13 (62%)	60 (38%)
B.S.+	11 (23%)	22 (25%)	1 (5%)	34 (21%)
M.A.	24 (50%)	24 (27%)	6 (28%)	54 (34%)
M.Ed.	1 (2%)	2 (2%)		3 (2%)
M.A.+	2 (4%)	3 (3%)	1 (5%)	6 (4%)
Specialist		1 (1%)		1 (1%)
Total	48 (30%)	89 (56%)	21 (14%)	158 (100%)

*Some schools have more than one coordinator in a program area. This table represents the responses of all coordinators.

This difference might be explained again by the requirement that Office Education coordinators were required to have at least two years of teaching experience before certification. This would give them an opportunity to pursue additional work beyond the Bachelor's degree prior to

coordinator certification. However, another feasible explanation is that the educational aspirations of Distributive and Office Education teachers may be different and that they may select their field of specialization based on that educational preference. Office Education coordinators, for example, might be more academically-oriented than Distributive Education coordinators who may be more people-oriented. Or, the explanation might be that Distributive Education coordinators are younger and have not had an opportunity to pursue graduate work. In addition, the Distributive Education certification courses have been built into the bachelor's program, whereas the Office Education certification courses have typically been taken post-baccalaureate or as part of a graduate program, thus providing an impetus for pursuing graduate work.. Finally, coordinators in Combined Programs may be in rural areas, isolated from graduate programs except through summer school offerings.

Major Field. Table 8 displays the major field in which the coordinators graduated.

TABLE 8

Major Field of Highest Degree*

Field	Program Area			Total
	OE	DE	Combined Programs	
Bus. Ed.	37 (77%)	26 (29%)	7 (33%)	70 (45%)
Dist. Ed.	1 (2%)	37 (42%)	5 (24%)	43 (27%)
Bus. & Dist. Ed.	1 (2%)	7 (8%)	1 (5%)	9 (6%)
Counselling			2 (10%)	2 (1%)
English	1 (2%)			1 (1%)
Education	7 (15%)	8 (9%)		15 (9%)
Industrial Ed.		2 (2%)	2 (10%)	4 (3%)
Math		2 (2%)		2 (1%)
Economics		2 (2%)		2 (1%)
Other	1 (2%)	5 (6%)	4 (18%)	10 (6%)
Total	48 (30%)	89 (56%)	21 (14%)	158 (100%)

*Some schools have more than one coordinator in a program area. This table represents the responses of all coordinators.

The information in this table is self-evident. The Distributive Education coordinators tend to come from a wide variety of backgrounds compared with Office Education coordinators. This may be explained by the different

career choices made by the two types of coordinators. Distributive Education coordinators may graduate, get some work experience in a retailing or distribution occupation, and then decide to go into teaching. Office Education coordinators, on the other hand, may make an earlier career choice and thus specialize in Business Education for their degree.

In addition, these data may suggest that Distributive Education is an expanding field. It has only been in recent years that a separate major in Distributive Education has become available in many colleges and universities. In many schools, this specialization was, and in some continues to be, part of Business Education. Thus, we find a large number of Distributive Education coordinators with a Business Education major.

Institutions Where Vocational Education Courses Were Taken. By far most of the responding coordinators, regardless of their field, have taken their vocational education courses at the University of Minnesota. This is perhaps a reflection of the length of time in which vocational education courses have been available at the state colleges and the number of teacher educators who are certified by the State at the various schools, with the University of Minnesota having many more certified teacher educators than any other school in the State. Another explanation might be that the majority of the cooperative courses are in the Minneapolis-St. Paul Metropolitan area, and the University of Minnesota is the most convenient. The data to support these conclusions are shown in Table 9.

TABLE 9

Institution at Which Vocational Education Courses Taken*

School	Program Area			Total
	OE	DE	Combined Programs	
U of M	28 (58%)	48 (54%)	10 (50%)	86 (55%)
UMD		3 (3%)	1 (5%)	4 (3%)
St. Cloud	10 (21%)	16 (18%)	1 (5%)	27 (17%)
Mankato	7 (15%)	7 (8%)	3 (15%)	17 (11%)
Moorhead		8 (9%)		8 (5%)
Bemidji			2 (10%)	2 (1%)
Out of State	3 (6%)	7 (8%)	3 (15%)	13 (8%)
Total	48 (31%)	89 (57%)	20 (2%)	157 (100%)

*Some schools have more than one coordinator in a program area. This table represents the responses of all coordinators.

Years of Teaching Experience. In Table 10, the total number of years of teaching experience and the years of teaching experience in the relevant cooperative program are shown.

TABLE 10

Number of Years of Teaching Experience*

Years of Teaching	Program Area			Total
	OE	DE	Combined Programs**	
Total:				
1-5	9 (19%)	36 (40%)	6 (29%)	51 (32%)
6-10	12 (25%)	24 (27%)	7 (33%)	43 (27%)
11-14	27 (56%)	29 (33%)	8 (38%)	64 (41%)
Median	12 years	7 years	7 years	8 years
Coop. OE:				
1-5	37 (77%)		9 (43%)	56 (78%)
6-10	4 (8%)	***	2 (10%)	7 (10%)
11-21	7 (15%)		1 (5%)	9 (12%)
Median	3 years		1 year	8 years
DE:				
1-5		63 (72%)	14 (67%)	80 (72%)
6-10	***	17 (19%)	2 (10%)	20 (18%)
11-25		8 (9%)	2 (10%)	11 (10%)
Median		3 years	1 year	2 years

*Some schools have more than one coordinator in a program area. This table represents the responses of all coordinators.

**These figures indicate that Combined Program coordinators have teaching experience in Cooperative Office and Distributive Education programs, as well as in Combined Programs.

***The figures were omitted for these categories because of their lack of relevance.

The median number of years of teaching experience totally is greater in the Office Education area than in the Distributive Education or Combined areas. However, the number of years of teaching experience within the related cooperative areas does not differ significantly in the two major program areas. The explanation for the greater number of years of teaching experience in the Office Education area is, as stated before, probably a result of the teaching experience requirement for certification in that area.

Enrollment in the Responding Schools

The size of the schools (grades 10-12) having cooperative programs is shown in Table 11.

TABLE 11

Enrollment in Schools with Cooperative Education Programs*

(Grades 10-12)

Enrollment	Schools Having the Following Programs:			Total
	OE	DE	Combined Programs	
Under 1,000	16 (36%)	34 (44%)	15 (83%)	65 (46%)
1,000-2,000	20 (44%)	32 (42%)	3 (17%)	55 (40%)
Over 2,000	9 (20%)	11 (13%)		20 (14%)
Total	45 (32%)	77 (55%)	18 (13%)	140 (100%)

*Each school with more than one coordinator in its program has been included only once in the calculations for this table.

There is not a significant difference in the size of the schools having Office Education and Distributive Education programs, although a slightly larger percentage of the Office Education programs are in large schools than in small. The major point to note from this table is the fact that almost all of the Combined Programs are in schools having an enrollment under 1,000.

Characteristics of the Cooperative Program

Two characteristics of the cooperative education program were determined through the questionnaire: the number of seniors in the program and the years of existence of the program.

Number of Seniors in Cooperative Programs. In comparing the data in Table 12, the major conclusion is that Distributive Education tends to have a larger percentage of its programs with large enrollments, i.e., over 30, than do Office Education programs. This is also to be expected from the fact that a larger number of Distributive Education coordinators reported two coordinators in the school than was found in Office Education.

TABLE 12

Number of Seniors in Cooperative Programs*

Number of Seniors	Program Area				Total
	OE	DE	OE in Combined Programs	DE in Combined Programs	
10 & under	4 (8%)	9 (12%)	9 (64%)	6 (35%)	28 (18%)
11-20	19 (41%)	27 (36%)	4 (29%)	7 (41%)	57 (37%)
21-30	19 (41%)	22 (27%)	1 (7%)	2 (12%)	44 (28%)
31-40	4 (8%)	11 (15%)		1 (6%)	16 (11%)
Over 40	1 (2%)	8 (10%)		1 (6%)	10 (6%)
Total	47 (30%)	77 (50%)	14 (9%)	17 (11%)	155 (100%)**

*Each school with more than one coordinator in its program has been included only once in the calculations for this table.

**This total reflects some duplication as Combined Program Coordinators have reported enrollments in programs they do not personally coordinate.

Age of Cooperative Programs. Surprisingly, as can be seen from the data in Table 13 on page 21, a greater percentage of Distributive Education programs are in the 1 to 3 years in existence category than are Office Education programs. This is surprising because of the fact that it was not until the 1963 Vocational Education Act that Office Education became a federally-reimbursable program. However, as is also evident, there are considerably more Distributive Education than Office Education programs and at each of the age levels there are in absolute numbers more Distributive Education than Office Education programs.

TABLE 13

Age of Cooperative Programs*

Number of Years	Program Area				Total
	OE	DE	OE in Combined Programs	DE in Combined Programs	
1-3	15 (33%)	33 (41%)	3 (24%)	4 (25%)	55 (36%)
4-6	16 (34%)	23 (29%)	5 (38%)	6 (37.5%)	50 (32%)
7-29	15 (33%)	24 (30%)	5 (38%)	6 (37.5%)	50 (32%)
Total	46 (30%)	80 (52%)	13 (8%)	16 (10%)	155 (100%)
Median	4.5 years	4 years	6 years	5 years	

*Each school with more than one coordinator in its program has been included only once in the calculations for this table.

Age of Vocational Student Organizations

Table 14 on the following page, displays the student organization and how long it has been in existence. DECA in Distributive Education and MOEA in Office Education account for 83 percent of the clubs represented. Various other organizations make up the balance.

Compensation Received by Advisor

The data received on compensation in Table 15 on page 22, is comparable to the findings reviewed in the Review of the Literature section. A somewhat greater percentage of Distributive Education student organization advisors receive compensation than do Office Education advisors. As a generalization, it is quite evident that it is not the typical pattern for vocational youth organization advisors to receive compensation for their involvement with the youth organization.

Income of Vocational Youth Organizations

The data collected from the questionnaire permit generalizations about the average income of the youth organization and its source.

TABLE 14

Years of Existence of Vocational Youth Organizations*

Vocational Youth Organization	Program Area			Total
	1-3	4-6	Over 6	
DECA	31 (46%)**	21 (31%)	15 (23%)	67 (52%)
MOEA	13 (32%)	23 (58%)	4 (10%)	40 (31%)
FBLA			2 (100%)	2 (2%)
Local Club	3 (43%)	3 (43%)	1 (14%)	7 (5%)
NSA		1 (100%)		1 (1%)
Other	4 (36%)	4 (36%)	3 (28%)	11 (9%)
Total	51 (40%)	52 (41%)	25 (19%)	128 (100%)

*Each school with more than one coordinator in its program has been included only once in the calculations for this table.

**Percentages in this table are calculated by rows rather than by columns.

TABLE 15

Compensation Received by Youth Organization Advisor*

Compensation	Program Area			Total
	OE	DE	Combined Programs	
None	36 (88%)	62 (83%)	18 (95%)	116 (86%)
Under $100		2 (2%)	1 (5%)	3 (2%)
$100-$200	3 (7%)	5 (7%)		8 (6%)
$200-$320	2 (5%)	6 (8%)		8 (6%)
Total	41 (30%)	75 (56%)	19 (14%)	135 (100%)

*Each school with more than one coordinator in its program has been included only once in the calculations for this table.

Average Yearly Income. Relatively, there are few differences among the three program areas compared in Table 16.

TABLE 16

Average Yearly Income of the Youth Organization*

Average Yearly Income	Program Area			Total
	OE	DE	Combined Programs	
$0-$250	10 (26%)	14 (20%)	6 (35%)	30 (24%)
$251-$500	7 (19%)	20 (29%)	5 (30%)	32 (26%)
$501-$750	5 (13%)	4 (5%)	1 (5.5%)	10 (8%)
$751-$1,000	9 (24%)	16 (23%)	2 (12%)	27 (22%)
$1,001-$1,500	5 (13%)	7 (10%)	1 (5.5%)	13 (10%)
$1,501-$2,000	1 (2.5%)	4 (6%)		5 (4%)
$2,001-$6,600	1 (2.5%)	5 (7%)	2 (12%)	8 (6%)
Total	38 (30%)	70 (56%)	17 (14%)	125 (100%)
Median	$600	$600	$350	$550

*Each school with more than one coordinator in its program has been included only once in the calculations for this table.

A fairly substantial number of the clubs (approximately 25 percent totally) had average yearly incomes of $250 or less. The median incomes in both the Office and Distributive Education areas were about $600 compared with $350 in the Combined Programs. The highest yearly income was in a Distributive Education program with a reported average yearly income of $6,600.

Source of Support. Table 17 on page 24 shows the percentage of the total income derived from dues, fund raisers, school, businesses, and other sources.

Very few differences exist among the program areas, with a very high percentage of income coming from a combination of dues and fund raisers. Very few schools provided financial support for the vocational youth organization and only a few of the vocational youth organizations solicited funds from local businesses. This area may be a fertile field for vocational youth organizations to explore in seeking support for students, particularly in inner-city schools. Businessmen, according to the Seventh

TABLE 17

Source of Support for Vocational Youth Organizations*

Source	Program Area			Total
	OE	DE	Combined Programs	
Dues:				
None	8 (19%)	14 (19%)	5 (28%)	27 (20%)
1-25%	23 (53%)	48 (66%)	9 (50%)	80 (60%)
26-50%	9 (21%)	8 (11%)	4 (22%)	21 (16%)
51-75%	1 (2%)	1 (1%)	0	2 (1%)
76-100%	2 (5%)	2 (3%)	0	4 (3%)
Median	10%	10%	10%	10%
Fund-Raisers:				
None	8 (19%)	17 (23%)	6 (33%)	31 (23%)
1-25%	2 (5%)	5 (7%)	0	7 (5%)
26-50%	7 (16%)	7 (10%)	4 (22%)	18 (14%)
51-75%	8 (19%)	14 (19%)	1 (6%)	23 (17%)
76-100%	18 (41%)	30 (41%)	7 (39%)	55 (41%)
Median	70%	75%	50%	74%
School:				
None	39 (91%)	66 (90%)	17 (94%)	122 (91%)
1-25%	3 (7%)	6 (8%)	0	9 (7%)
26-50%	1 (2%)	1 (2%)	0	2 (1%)
51-75%	0	0	0	0
76-100%	0	0	1 (6%)	1 (1%)
Median	0%	0%	0%	0%
Business				
None	41 (95%)	69 (95%)	18 (100%)	128 (96%)
1-25%	2 (5%)	3 (4%)	0	5 (3%)
26-50%	0	1 (1%)	0	1 (1%)
51-75%	0	0	0	0
76-100%	0	0	0	0
Median	0%	0%	0%	0%

TABLE 17 (continued)

Source of Support for Vocational Youth Organizations*

Source	Program Area			Total
	OE	DE	Combined Programs	
Other:				
None	40 (93%)	62 (85%)	17 (94%)	119 (89%)
1-25%	2 (5%)	2 (3%)	0	4 (3%)
26-50%	1 (2%)	2 (3%)	1 (6%)	4 (3%)
51-75%	0	3 (4%)	0	3 (2%)
76-100%	0	4 (5%)	0	4 (3%)
Median	0%	0%	0%	0%

*Each school with more than one coordinator in its program has been included only once in the calculations for this table.

Report of the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education, do support the vocational youth organizations philosophically. If they feel that a vocational youth organization contributes to the vocational competency of the students, they might also be willing to make contributions to support the activities of the youth organization. On the other hand, if the vocational student organization is to be an integral part of the curriculum, it is appropriate that their activities be supported by the school.

There were three additional sources of support for the vocational youth organizations provided by the coordinators for the option marked "other." The major "other" support was the school store, indicated by nine respondents. It is obvious that there is some duplication between this response and the response marked "fund raising." The same comment is true for the category of "concessions and dances," provided by three coordinators. Finally, four coordinators specified "student expenses" incurred for attending the state leadership conferences.

Membership Policies

Tables 18 and 19 contain the data pertaining to mandatory membership policies and membership qualifications.

Mandatory Membership. A slightly higher percentage of Office Education coordinators require membership at all three levels than are required by Distributive Education coordinators, as displayed in Table 18.

TABLE 18

Coordinators' Policies on Required Membership*

Type of Membership	Program Area			Total
	OE	DE	Combined Programs	
Required:				
Local	36 (86%)	64 (77%)	14 (82%)	114 (80%)
State	37 (88%)	61 (73%)	12 (71%)	110 (77%)
National	34 (81%)	58 (70%)	11 (65%)	103 (73%)
Should be Required:				
Local	11 (26%)	22 (26%)	7 (41%)	40 (28%)
State	11 (26%)	20 (24%)	6 (35%)	37 (26%)
National	12 (29%)	19 (23%)	6 (35%)	37 (26%)

*Some schools have more than one coordinator in a program area. This table represents the responses of all coordinators.

An interesting observation from this table is that a considerably higher percentage of all coordinators require membership than feel that membership should be required. The fact that membership is required is perhaps a reflection of the policy statement issued by the State Department of Minnesota requiring that youth organizations be available to all students. However, since the guidelines do not say that membership in the organization is required for individual students, it is difficult to understand why coordinators do not feel that it should be required and yet on their own require membership of the students.

A significant Chi Square (with $p < .05$) was obtained on the requirement of local membership using the variable of enrollment in the school. Medium-sized schools did not require local membership as much as would be expected by chance, while large schools, that is, those over 1,000, required local membership more than would be expected by chance.

Membership Qualifications. When asked their feelings about what membership qualifications should exist for vocational youth organizations, a slightly higher percentage of Distributive Education and Combined Program

coordinators felt that membership should be available to students in cooperative programs only as compared with the Office Education coordinators (see Table 19, below). However, in both the Office and Distributive Education areas, the majority of coordinators felt that the activities should be available to students not enrolled in cooperative programs.

TABLE 19

Membership Qualifications in Vocational Youth Organization*

Qualification	Program Area			Total
	OE	DE	Combined Programs	
In Coop Program Only	17 (40%)	40 (48%)	9 (53%)	66 (46%)
Not in Coop Program	26 (60%)	43 (52%)	8 (47%)	77 (54%)
Seniors Only	5 (12%)	2 (2%)	3 (18%)	10 (7%)
Juniors & Seniors	35 (81%)	58 (68%)	10 (59%)	103 (70%)
Sophomores, Juniors & Seniors	3 (7%)	24 (28%)	4 (23%)	31 (22%)
Others		1 (1%)		1 (1%)

*Some schools have more than one coordinator in a program area. This table represents the responses of all coordinators.

In terms of the grade level of the student, a Chi Square, significant at the .01 level, was obtained based on program area differences. Office Education coordinators felt that the program should be open to seniors only or to juniors and seniors only in a proportion higher than would be expected by chance. Distributive Education coordinators felt that it should be open to sophomores, juniors, and seniors in a proportion greater than would be expected by chance, and the Combined Program coordinators indicated seniors only in a proportion significantly greater than chance. However, in each program area by far the greatest percentage of respondents indicated that membership should be open to juniors and seniors only.

Relationship of Youth Organization to Classroom

Two components of the interaction between the classroom and the vocational youth organization were obtained from the advisors: the amount

of time that is spent and should be spent in the classroom for youth activities, and the percent of the grade given in the related class for activity in the vocational youth organization.

Classroom Time Used. Table 20 indicates that there is little difference among the three program areas as to the percentage of time that is spent and the coordinators' attitudes toward the amount of time that should be spent in the classroom for vocational student activities.

TABLE 20

Classroom Time Used for Vocational Youth Activities*

Time Per Week	Program Area			Total
	OE	DE	Combined Programs	
Spent:				
None	7 (18%)	15 (19%)	3 (19%)	25 (19%)
1-3 hours	31 (79%)	64 (80%)	13 (81%)	108 (80%)
4-6 hours	1 (3%)			1 (.5%)
More than 6 hours		1 (1%)		1 (.5%)
Should be Spent:				
None	5 (12%)	12 (15%)	4 (24%)	21 (15%)
1-3 hours	36 (86%)	67 (83%)	13 (76%)	116 (83%)
4-6 hours	1 (2%)	1 (1%)		2 (1%)
More than 6 hours		1 (1%)		1 (1%)

*Some schools have more than one coordinator in a program area. This table represents the responses of all coordinators.

There is little variance between the time that is actually spent and the time the coordinators feel should be spent. A large majority of coordinators feel that 1 to 3 hours a week is an appropriate amount of classroom time to use for vocational student activities.

Percentage of Grade Given. From the data in Table 21, Distributive Education coordinators tend to place slightly more emphasis on vocational student organization activities in the classroom grade than is true for Office Education coordinators. This applies also in terms of the coordinators' perceptions of what percent of the grade should be given for such activities.

TABLE 21

Percent of Grade Given for Participation in Vocational Youth Activities*

Percent	Program Area			Total
	OE	DE	Combined Programs	
Given:				
None	20 (51%)	32 (41%)	9 (56%)	61 (46%)
1-10%	14 (36%)	29 (37%)	5 (31%)	48 (36%)
11-25%	3 (8%)	16 (21%)	2 (13%)	21 (16%)
26-40%	2 (5%)	1 (1%)		3 (2%)
Over 40%				0 (0%)
Should be Given:				
None	17 (42%)	23 (29%)	7 (41%)	47 (35%)
1-10%	15 (38%)	27 (34%)	7 (41%)	49 (36%)
11-25%	7 (18%)	26 (33%)	3 (18%)	36 (26%)
26-40%	1 (2%)	2 (3%)		3 (2%)
Over 40%		1 (1%)		1 (1%)

*Some schools have more than one coordinator in a program area. This table represents the responses of all coordinators.

It is interesting to note that for all program areas, the feeling is that more emphasis in the grade should be placed on vocational student organization activities than is currently given. Again, this discrepancy is difficult to explain unless schools have made specific policy statements indicating that vocational student organization activities should not be given more than a certain percentage of weight in the classroom. Additionally, an explanation of this discrepancy might be that the coordinator who advises the vocational student organization may not be the teacher in the classroom.

Role of the Advisor

Table 22 indicates the role that the coordinator perceives himself filling as the advisor in the vocational youth organization.

TABLE 22

Coordinators' Perceived Role as Advisor*

Role	Program Area			Total
	OE	DE	Combined Programs	
Provide Leadership	8 (22%)	5 (6%)	3 (18%)	16 (13%)
Share Leadership Responsibility Equally with Students	17 (47%)	38 (48%)	7 (40%)	62 (46%)
Volunteer Help When Coordinator Sees A Need	11 (31%)	31 (39%)	3 (18%)	45 (34%)
Available For Help Only When Asked		3 (4%)	2 (12%)	5 (4%)
Other		2 (3%)	2 (12%)	4 (3%)
Total	36 (27%)	79 (60%)	17 (13%)	132 (100%)

*Some schools have more than one coordinator in a program area. This table represents the responses of all coordinators.

A significant Chi Square was obtained on this question based on both the number of years of teaching experience of the coordinator and on the program area of the coordinator. While the category selected by most coordinators was "share leadership responsibility equally with students," it did not in any case receive a clear majority of the coordinators' selections. Office Education coordinators tended to select "provide leadership" proportionately more than did the other program areas ($p < .05$). Distributive Education tended to select "volunteer help when coordinator sees a need" proportionately more than did the other program areas. The Combined Programs area selected both "available for help only when needed" and "other" proportionately more frequently than did the other program areas.

In terms of teaching experience, teachers with 5 years of teaching experience and under tended to select "volunteer help when coordinator sees a need" relatively more frequently than did the other coordinators ($p < .05$).

Coordinators with 6 to 14 years of teaching experience selected the first two options listed in the table proportionately more frequently, and those with 15 and more years of teaching experience selected the option, "share leadership responsibility equally with students," more frequently than would be expected by a chance distribution.

Many advisors checked a combination of the responses. In addition, two advisors commented that their role depends on the maturity of the students. Two other advisors indicated that their role changes from day to day as the year progresses and as students develop. Additional comments made by the advisors were simply variations of the options available to the advisors.

Adequacy of Teacher Education Programs

Of all coordinators responding, only a very slight majority indicated that they felt that the teacher education program had been adequate in preparing them to be an advisor (see Table 23 below).

TABLE 23

Coordinators' Evaluation of Adequacy of Teacher Education Program in Preparation to be an Advisor*

Evaluation	Program Area			Total
	OE	DE	Combined Programs	
Adequate	20 (44%)	43 (52%)	10 (62%)	73 (51%)
Inadequate	25 (56%)	40 (48%)	6 (38%)	71 (49%)
Total	45 (31%)	83 (58%)	16 (11%)	144 (100%)

*Some schools have more than one coordinator in a program area. This table represents the responses of all coordinators.

The Office Education program area felt as a group that their preparation had been inadequate proportionally more than did the Distributive Education and the Combined Programs coordinators, although this difference was not statistically significant. This can perhaps be accounted for by the fact that pressure for affiliation with a national organization in Office Education has been much more recent than for Distributive Education programs. In addition, Office Education programs

do not have access to collegiate youth organization programs as is now true for Distributive Education coordinators. This lack of actual experience may account for a greater feeling of inadequacy among the Office Educators than is found in the other two programs.

In addition to the specific question of whether the advisor's preparation had been adequate, an open-ended question asked what additional preparation(s) he would have found useful. The responses are classified in categories with the number of advisors responding shown in parentheses. Where no number is shown, only one advisor made the comment. The responses are listed in order according to the number of advisors selecting that response:

Need a youth organization class (28)
Need to work with a coordinator in a youth organization setting and attend functions while in school (11)
Nothing was mentioned about youth groups in college (8) (All but one of the coordinators making this response were from two Minnesota State Colleges.)
Need better units in the cooperative coordination courses (7)
Need more information and discussion from the State Department and national organizations with less idealism (5) Comments were made about the national DECA organization being too reactionary, too conservative, and so on.
More human relations training needed, e.g., cooperativeness, motivation, and group dynamics (4)
More focus on leadership conferences needed (4)
Need practical experience while in college other than student teaching, e.g., a collegiate youth organization (4)
Greater commitment on the part of teacher educators is needed (2)
No one ever stops learning--there is always need for more information
Be in a cooperative program in high school
Get back to the basics

Youth Organization Activities

Table 24, on page 33, displays the five major activities in which vocational youth organizations participated during the 1970-71 school year.

Table 25,on the following page, displays the five major activities judged to be of "great value" by the coordinators.

In comparing the top five activities chosen, there is little difference among program areas as to the activities chosen, while there is some difference in the order in which they were selected. A total list of the activities and the value placed on the activities by the coordinators by individual program areas and as a total can be found in the Appendix in Tables 32 to 39.

TABLE 24

Major Activities of Vocational Youth Organizations*
1970-71

Activity	Number and Percent of Schools Participating**			
	Total	OE	DE	Combined Programs
1. News Articles	119 (91%)	35 (88%)	69 (93%)	15 (88%)
2. Employer-Employee Banquet	112 (86%)	35 (88%)	62 (84%)	15 (88%)
3. State Leadership Conferences	110 (84%)	32 (80%)	64 (86%)	14 (82%)
4. Classroom Speakers	110 (84%)	37 (92%)	61 (82%)	12 (71%)
5. Sales Projects	107 (82%)	34 (85%)	60 (81%)	13 (76%)

*Each school with more than one coordinator in its program has been included only once in the calculations for this table.

**Percents may be different for the same number of respondents as the percent is based on the total number of respondents for each activity. Some respondents do not indicate a choice for some activities.

TABLE 25

Major Activities Judged to be of "Great Value"*

Activity	Number and Percent of Coordinators Responding			
	Total	OE	DE	Combined Programs
1. State Leadership Conferences	88 (62%)	22 (50%)	56 (69%)	10 (63%)
2. Employer-Employee Banquets	88 (62%)	30 (68%)	48 (58%)	10 (63%)
3. Individual Competitive Events	81 (57%)	19 (43%)	51 (62%)	11 (65%)
4. Classroom Speakers	78 (55%)	21 (48%)	48 (59%)	9 (53%)
5. News Articles	76 (53%)	25 (57%)	43 (52%)	8 (47%)

*Some schools have more than one coordinator in a program area. This table represents the responses of all coordinators.

The significant Chi Squares are displayed by the variable used for classification in Tables 26-30, below, with all Chi Squares computed displayed in Table 39 of the Appendix. The activity is listed with the area in which a greater proportion of responses was obtained than would have been expected by chance distribution.

TABLE 26

Significant Chi Squares for Participation in, and Value of, Vocational Youth Organization Activities, Based on Age of Respondent

Activity	Age		
	Under 30	31-40	Over 40
State Leadership Conferences	Great value	Great value	Some value
National Leadership Conferences	Great value	Great value & some value	Some value & no value
Sales Projects	Great value	Some value	No value
Fund Raising Through Participation in Local Business Community Activity	Great value	Some value	No value
Fund Raising Through Participation in School-Community Activity	Great value	Great value & some value	Some value & no value
Employer-Employee Banquet	Some value	Great value	No value
Sponsor School Dance	Great value	Some value	No value

TABLE 27

Significant Chi Squares for Participation in, and Value of, Vocational Youth Organization Activities, Based on Sex of Respondent

Activity	Male	Female
Chapter Competitive Events at Leadership Conferences	Did not participate	Participated
Civic Involvement	Did not participate	Participated
School-Wide Auditorium Programs	Some value	Great value & no value

A variety of specific activities were listed by advisors in the "other" category. Their comments follow with the number of coordinators making the response listed in parentheses, unless only one coordinator made the comment:

Visit post-secondary schools
Field trips to businesses
Coke parties for new members
Talk to local social clubs (2)
Establish yearly "program of work" with budget
More workshops and clinics at leadership conferences rather than competitive events (2)
Participate in city sales promotions
DECA advertising
Less focus on state activities and more on local activities especially for out-state people

Several advisors indicated that while they felt that fund raising activities would be worthwhile and of value to the students, they were not permitted by their schools or school districts to participate in such activities.

TABLE 28

Significant Chi Squares for Participation in, and value of, Vocational Youth Organization Activities, Based on Years of Teaching Experience

Activity	5 Years and Under	6-14 Years	15 Years and Over
National Leadership Conferences	Great value	Some value	Some value & no value
Sales Projects	Great value Participated	Some value Participated	No value Did not participate
Fund Raising Through Participation in School-Community Activity	Great value	Some value	Some value & no value
Career Workshops or Clinics	Participated	Participated	Did not participate
Employer-Employee Banquets	Some value	Great value	No value
Establish Occupational Library	Great value & no value	Great value	Some value

TABLE 29

Significant Chi Squares for Participation in, and Value of, Vocational Youth Organization Activities, Based on Program Areas

Activity	Office Education	Distributive Education	Combined Programs
Sales Projects	Some value & no value	Great value	No value
Fund Raising Through Participation in Local Business Community Activity	Some value	Great value & no value	Great value
Fund Raising Through Participation in School-Community Activity	Some value & no value	Great value	Great value
Career Workshops or Clinics	Did not participate	Participated	Did not participate
School-wide Auditorium Programs	Great value & no value	Some value	Some value
Hold an Open House for Parents, Employers, and Faculty	Participated	Participated	Did not participate
Prepare a Vocational Youth Organization Handbook	Did not participate	Participated	Did not participate
Social Cultural Development	Great value	Some value & no value	Great value

TABLE 30

Significant Chi Squares for Participation in, and Value of, Vocational Youth Organization Activities, Based on Enrollment in the School (Grades 10-12)

Activity	500 and Under	501-1000	Over 1000
National Leadership Conferences	Did not participate		Participated
Fund Raising Through Participation in Local Business Community Activity		Some value	No value
Fund Raising Through Participation in School-Community Activity	Did not participate	Participated	Did not participate
Individual Competitive Events at Leadership Conferences	Did not participate	Participated	Participated
Employer-Employee Banquet	Did not participate	Participated	
Leadership Training Seminar	Did not participate	Participated	Participated
Hold Joint Meetings with Other Organizations	Some value Did not participate	Great value Participated	No value Participated
Arrange for Classroom Speakers	Did not participate	Great value Participated	Some value Did not participate
Formal Leadership Training	Did not participate		Participated

Youth Organization Objectives

Table 31 displays the top five objectives selected by the vocational youth organization coordinators. A total list of the objectives chosen by the coordinators by individual program areas and as a total can be found in the Appendix in Tables 32-39.

TABLE 31

Major Objectives of Vocational Youth Organizations Judged to be of "Great Value"*

Objective	Number and Percent of Coordinators Responding**			
	Total	OE	DE	Combined Programs
1. Develop student leadership ability.	108 (75%)	36 (82%)	60 (72%)	12 (71%)
2. Participate in state and national contests.	94 (66%)	27 (61%)	58 (71%)	9 (53%)
3. Develop student social maturity.	78 (54%)	25 (57%)	43 (52%)	10 (59%)
4. Develop skill in competition.	62 (43%)	14 (32%)	42 (51%)	6 (35%)
5. Acquire prestige and recognition.	62 (43%)	18 (41%)	35 (42%)	9 (53%)

*Some schools have more than one coordinator in a program area. This table represents the responses of all coordinators.

**Percents may be different for the same number of respondents as the percent is based on the total number of respondents for each activity. Some respondents do not indicate a choice for some activities.

Few of the Chi Squares were significant in this category. The ones that were significant are presented on the following page, along with the choices that occurred more frequently than would be expected by chance occurrence.

Differences Based on Age. The objective, "have personal contact with leaders in profession," was selected as "some value" by the under 30 and over 40 categories, and coordinators between 31 to 40 years of age selected "great value" more than would be expected.

Differences Based on Sex. Two objectives produced significant Chi Square values based on the variable of sex. "Improve school administrators' interest" was selected by males to be of "great value" and "some value," whereas females selected it as "some value" or "no value." "Aid in awareness of career options" was selected by males to be of "great value" and by females to be of "some value" or "no value."

Differences Based on Years of Teaching Experience. Only one objective, "participate in state and national contests," produced a significant Chi Square value. Those with 5 years of teaching experience or less selected it to be of "great value" or "no value," those with 6 to 14 years of experience selected it as "great value" or "some value," and those with 15 years or more selected it as having "some value."

Differences Based on Program Areas. Office Education coordinators selected "develop skill in competition" as having "some value," Distributive Educators, "great value" or "no value," and Combined Programs coordinators assessed this objective as having "some value."

Differences Based on Enrollment. Two objectives had significant Chi Square values using the variable of enrollment. Schools with enrollments of 500 or less selected "some value" for "improve school administrators' interest." Medium-sized schools with enrollments between 501 to 1,000 students selected this objective as having "great value" or "no value," while schools with enrollments over 1,000 indicated "great value." For "receive news of latest developments in chosen career," schools under 500 indicated they felt it had "some value," schools with 501 to 1000 students indicated "great value," and schools with over 1000 indicated "no value."

Summary

In this section descriptive data were presented on the results of the questionnaires returned by the Office Education, Distributive Education, and Combined Programs coordinators. Summary tables only were presented in the body of this report for activities and objectives. Detailed tables on activities and objectives are presented in the Appendix by program area and by total. In addition, Chi Square values that were significant were presented in the body of the report; complete Chi Square values are presented in the Appendix.

The results presented in the tables suggest that there are few differences in philosophies on any of the analyzed variables: either by program area, by sex or age of the coordinator, by years of teaching experience of the coordinator, or by enrollment in the school. The few Chi Squares that were significant dealt basically with activities judged to be of great value and activities in which the clubs had participated. However, it should

also be kept in mind that a large number of Chi Square values were computed and using a significant value of .05, it would be expected that simply by chance one out of 20 Chi Squares would indicate some significance.

By program areas, there were significant differences in the characteristics of the coordinators. Office Education coordinators tended to be older, were more likely to be females, were more likely to have an advanced degree, were more likely to have their highest degree in their field of specialization, and had more years of total teaching experience. Coordinators in the State of Minnesota, regardless of their field of specialization, are most likely to have received their vocational education training at the University of Minnesota.

In terms of the program itself, proportionately a greater number of Distributive Education programs are to be found in smaller schools, while a proportionately greater percentage of Office Education programs are to be found in large schools. Within the cooperative program itself, however, Distributive Education programs tend to enroll a much larger number in the program than was found for Office Education programs. Proportionately the cooperative program has been in existence for more years in Combined Programs and somewhat longer in Office Education than in Distributive Education. The vocational student organizations proportionately are either younger or older in Distributive Education than in Office Education, with Office Education programs centering around 4 to 6 years of existence. Advisors for vocational student organizations are not likely to receive an income. Those that do cannot expect to receive more than $320 for the year. The median yearly income of the youth organizations in both Office Education and Distributive Education is $600 with a range from $0 to $6,600. In almost all cases, the source of these funds comes from dues and fund raising activities, regardless of the program area.

While a large number of coordinators require membership in the vocational student organization at all levels in all programs, a much smaller percentage feel that membership should be required. In fact, in both program areas this percentage is about 25 percent. Again in both program areas, the majority of coordinators feel that membership should be open to students who are not enrolled in cooperative programs. However, Office Educators feel more strongly than do Distributive Educators on this point. In terms of class within the school, Distributive Educators feel more strongly than do Office Educators that club membership should be open to sophomores. In both cases, a fairly substantial majority of coordinators feel that membership should be open only to juniors and seniors.

In terms of the amount of classroom time used for vocational student activities, a large majority felt 1 to 3 hours per week was appropriate to spend in the classroom and, in fact, a majority were spending that amount of time for club activities. No clear majority existed as to the percentage of the grade that coordinators felt should be given for participation in vocational student activities. The greatest number of Office Educators and Distributive Educators felt that somewhere between 1 to 25 percent of the grade should be given for vocational student activities. However, over 50% of Office Educators said that actually none was given, while Distributive Educators actually used 1 to 25 percent.

In both program areas, the largest percentage of coordinators felt that their roles should be to share leadership responsibility equally with students. However, there was great diversity of opinion on this question, with no single role being given a majority. In both Office Education and Distributive Education fields, a substantial number felt that their teacher education program had been inadequate. A clear majority of Office Educators indicated that their training had been inadequate while a slightly greater number of Distributive Educators felt that their training had been adequate.

The major activities selected by the coordinators were the same in both Office Education and Distributive Education, although the rank order was somewhat different between the two programs. The top five activities participated in during 1970-71 were: news articles, employer-employee banquet, state leadership conferences, classroom speakers, and sales projects. In terms of the coordinators' judgment about the value of activities, again the two program areas agreed on the top five activities. The only differences that existed between their perceptions of the valuable activities and activities actually participated in was that individual competitive events was judged to be of greater value while sales projects, while participated in, was not judged to be among the top five most valuable activities.

Finally, the following five objectives were selected by both program areas as having the greatest value: develop student leadership ability, participate in state and national contests, develop student social maturity, develop skill in competition, and acquire prestige and recognition.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Based on the results of this survey, the following conclusions and recommendations are made:

1. Teacher education institutions need to take a more active role in preparing coordinators as advisors to vocational student organizations. This should take the form of both pre-service and in-service education. In addition, it may mean a greater participation of teacher education institutions in the operation and functioning of vocational student organizations at both the state and national levels.

2. Teacher education institutions, the State Department, and local school boards need to take a more active role in recruiting women for certification as cooperative education coordinators, assisting them in locating coordination positions. This is a particularly serious problem in Distributive Education, but is also a problem in Office Education.

3. There is considerable diversity within single program areas regarding practices used. It would seem to be advantageous

for the State Department in cooperation with coordinators and teacher educators, to provide a set of guidelines on vocational student organizations so that the organizations can take their appropriate role in the curriculum (i.e., as co-curricular with on-the-job training and related instruction), but so that they do not replace the cooperative education program, as some respondents indicated was happening. Such guidelines should be interpreted as suggestions only and might deal with questions such as compensation for advisors, the amount of classroom time to be used for vocational student organization activities, and how that time might be used, the percentage of grade that might be reflected by vocational student organization involvement, and so on.

4. Consideration needs to be given by the vocational student organizations and the State Department as to the population to be served. Again, it was quite clear that there is dissatisfaction among the advisors regarding the restrictive nature of membership in existing organizations. Concern needs to be directed toward enlarging opportunities for non-cooperative education students who have vocational education goals, for students exploring careers, and for students who have not yet entered their junior year. This concern is reflected in the Seventh Report of the National Advisory Council for Vocational Education wherein they recommend membership for sophomores. This is also in line with current thinking regarding career education. If the vocational student organization does in fact contribute to vocational competence, then students who may drop out after their sophomore year should be permitted exposure to vocational student organization activities.

5. Some of the differences that were identified in terms of activities and objectives were reflections of size of school. Students enrolled in small schools cannot always participate in activities available to students in larger schools because of facilities and resources. Special consideration must be given to the role and the difficulties of the vocational youth organization in the vocational centers as the centers take on more and more of the vocational education of students in small schools. Through the centers, activities that have not been available to students in small schools will become more available to them.

6. Coordinators felt rather strongly that the objectives of developing leadership and attendance at leadership conferences were very valuable to their students. However, it is also clear that such attendance is limiting to students in out-state areas and to disadvantaged

students. This weakness in vocational student organizations might be overcome in two ways: the movement towards regionalization will permit students to have some involvement in leadership conferences at a level beyond the local level. In addition, it seems incumbent on the State Department to consider funding for students who wish to attend leadership conferences. If, in fact, as has been stated so frequently, the vocational student organization is an integral part of the cooperative education program and if finances are limiting many students from attending the leadership conference, then the State Department and federal government are neglecting a major area in which they should be involved.

7. The large number of coordinators in Distributive Education who do not have Distributive Education degrees and the large number of coordinators in both fields, but particularly in the Distributive Education field, who do not have advanced degrees suggests that there is an important role for teacher education institutions in meeting the in-service needs of coordinators. The movement throughout the State, at both the University and the State Colleges, towards in-service advanced degrees designed to meet the specific needs of individuals in the environment in which they work should be useful in providing the advanced training needed by the coordinators.

8. The University of Minnesota has historically provided the bulk of the vocational education training in the State of Minnesota. The data also indicate that only eight percent of the vocational training taken by the responding coordinators was taken out-of-state. This finding has implications to the State Department in terms of continuing support for the vocational education training taking place within the State of Minnesota.

9. Vocational student organizations, both at the state level and at the local level, need to give consideration to other sources of funds than dues and fund raising activities. As indicated in the body of the report, it seems evident that at least one major source of funds that has to date remained untapped has been businesses. The Trade and Industrial area has for many years enjoyed support from industry. It seems appropriate that at this time Office and Distributive Education organizations start to give consideration to support from this section of the economy.

10. Responding coordinators expressed fairly strongly their concern about the State Guidelines on Vocational Youth Organizations as they pertain to the membership requirements. This feeling is further reflected in the discrepancy between the number of coordinators requiring membership and the number who felt membership should be required.

It is evident that among practicing coordinators the overriding value of the vocational student organization is not felt nearly as strongly as it is by state and national personnel in vocational education. Perhaps, there is a need for reconsideration by state and federal agencies regarding the value that they place on the vocational student organizations.

Certainly there is a very important need for research to be conducted to isolate the specific gains made by students who have participated in vocational student organizations and to compare the vocational competency of such students with those who have not been affiliated with vocational student organizations. It is important to understand whether there is, in fact, any incremental value to the vocational student organization and, if there is, what they are specifically. This need is underscored when evaluating those activities selected by coordinators as being of the greatest value. For example, news articles appears high on the list both of activities participated in and those judged to be of great value. It is impossible for the author to conceive of any way whatsoever that a student can gain vocationally from that experience. Sales projects, except for students in distributive occupations, would seem to provide little valuable vocational training. Classroom speakers is an activity that can certainly take place without a vocational student organization. These are the kinds of considerations that need to be given to a research design on the value of the vocational student organization.

11. This particular study questioned coordinators regarding their attitudes towards vocational student organizations. A very valuable and necessary follow-up would be to ask similar questions of students in vocational education programs, both those participating in vocational student organizations and those who have chosen not to participate.

12. In Office Education, an interesting study would be a national study comparing the attitudes of coordinators, teachers, and students in schools with Office Education Association affiliation and schools with Future Business Leaders of America affiliation to see whether or not such organizations are duplicating efforts or whether in fact each organization has something different to offer and should co-exist with each other. It seems apparent that, if each is serving the same function, Office Education is involved in a competitive situation that weakens the total impact of the vocational student organization involvement.

REFERENCES

1. Bicanich, W.F. Distributive Education students' reactions to the cooperative part-time Distributive Education programs in Minnesota. Unpublished master's paper, University of Minnesota, 1964.

2. Collard, G.L. A study of factors influencing non-participation of Distributive Education coordinators in the DECA youth organization. Unpublished master's paper, University of Minnesota, 1970.

3. Cottrell, R.G. Factors influencing student participation in Minnesota Distributive Education clubs. Unpublished master's paper, University of Minnesota, 1966.

4. Groves, R.M. A national survey of vocational education programs for students with special needs. Columbus: The Center for Vocational and Technical Education, The Ohio State University, 1967.

5. Keller, L. The teaching and coordination of Cooperative Office Education. In: C.C. Calhoun and M. Hillestad. (Ed.), Contributions of Research to Business Education, National Business Education Yearbook, No. 9, 1971, Pp. 114-130. Washington, D.C.: The Association.

6. Krier, L. A comparative analysis of the professional views of DECA held by DE college teacher-educators and DE teacher-coordinators. Unpublished master's paper, Mankato State College, 1971.

7. Nardini, G. Coordinators' survey about club activities. The Minnesota Vocational Coordinators Association, 1970. Mimeographed.

8. National Advisory Council on Vocational Education. Vocational student organizations. Seventh Report of the Advisory Council. Washington D.C., 1972.

TABLE 32

Frequencies and Percentages for All Respondents on Objectives*

Objective	Value Assigned		
	Great Value	Some Value	No Value
Improve student motivation in class	57 (39%)	83 (57%)	5 (4%)
Improve student motivation on the job	31 (21%)	93 (64%)	21 (15%)
Improve employers' interest in the program	41 (28%)	89 (62%)	14 (10%)
Improve school administrators' interest	51 (36%)	78 (55%)	14 (9%)
Develop student leadership ability	108 (75%)	36 (25%)	
Develop student social maturity	78 (54%)	66 (46%)	
Aid vocational understanding	34 (24%)	93 (64%)	17 (12%)
Aid in awareness of career options	22 (15%)	108 (75%)	14 (10%)
Receive news of latest developments in chosen career	10 (7%)	88 (62%)	44 (31%)
Have personal contact with leaders in profession	45 (32%)	83 (58%)	14 (10%)
Participate in State and National Contests (competitive events)	94 (66%)	42 (29%)	7 (5%)
Develop occupational competencies	27 (19%)	101 (70%)	16 (11%)
Acquire prestige and recognition	62 (43%)	75 (52%)	7 (5%)
Develop skill in competition	62 (43%)	76 (53%)	6 (4%)
Develop awareness of ethical business practices	27 (19%)	94 (65%)	23 (16%)
Develop civic consciousness (citizenship)	52 (36%)	81 (56%)	11 (8%)
Develop respect for education	25 (17%)	99 (69%)	20 (14%)
Develop economic appreciation	26 (19%)	94 (67%)	20 (14%)
Enrich and complement instruction	48 (33%)	91 (63%)	5 (4%)

*Evaluations are reported for all responding coordinators. Participation is reported by school, with duplicate schools eliminated.

TABLE 33

Frequencies and Percentages for All Respondents on Activities*

Activity	Value Assigned			
	Great Value	Some Value	No Value	Participated
State leadership conferences	88 (62%)	50 (36%)	3 (2%)	110 (84%)
National leadership conferences	53 (40%)	71 (53%)	10 (7%)	55 (42%)
Sales projects (e.g. cookie sales)	37 (26%)	89 (63%)	16 (11%)	107 (82%)
Fund raising through participation in local business community activity (e.g. display or office services)	34 (25%)	91 (66%)	13 (9%)	42 (32%)
Fund raising through participation in school community activity (e.g. school store or typing service)	49 (35%)	77 (56%)	13 (9%)	68 (52%)
Individual competitive events at leadership conference	81 (57%)	59 (41%)	3 (2%)	102 (78%)
Chapter competitive events at leadership conference	51 (36%)	79 (56%)	12 (8%)	53 (40%)
Career workshops or clinics	50 (35%)	76 (54%)	15 (11%)	67 (51%)
Employer-employee banquet/luncheons/ breakfasts	88 (62%)	50 (35%)	5 (3%)	112 (86%)
Civic involvement (e.g. clothing for the needy)	52 (37%)	76 (54%)	12 (9%)	66 (50%)
Leadership training seminar (e.g. Student Council training)	38 (28%)	81 (60%)	15 (11%)	28 (21%)
Schoolwide auditorium programs	14 (10%)	93 (69%)	29 (21%)	16 (12%)

(Table 33 continued on the following page)

TABLE 33 (continued)

Frequencies and Percentages for All Respondents on Objectives*

Activity	Value Assigned			
	Great Value	Some Value	No Value	Participated
School dance sponsorship	7 (5%)	83 (60%)	49 (35%)	33 (25%)
News articles in school and local newspapers	76 (53%)	65 (45%)	3 (2%)	119 (91%)
Display of information and awards at school	60 (42%)	76 (53%)	8 (5%)	92 (70%)
Establishment of an occupational library	51 (36%)	82 (58%)	9 (6%)	39 (30%)
Open house for parents, employers, faculty	62 (44%)	69 (49%)	9 (7%)	60 (46%)
Regular vocational youth organization meetings	56 (40%)	81 (57%)	4 (3%)	95 (73%)
Preparation of a vocational youth organization handbook	31 (22%)	97 (69%)	31 (9%)	27 (21%)
Joint meetings with other organizations	29 (21%)	92 (66%)	18 (13%)	54 (41%)
Classroom speakers	78 (55%)	63 (44%)	2 (1%)	110 (84%)
Speakers for meetings outside of class	42 (31%)	77 (56%)	18 (13%)	39 (30%)
Social/cultural development (e.g. dinners, theater, teas, etc.)	41 (30%)	88 (63%)	10 (7%)	64 (49%)
Formal leadership training	60 (43%)	74 (53%)	6 (4%)	33 (25%)

*Evaluations are reported for all responding coordinators. Participation is reported by school, with duplicate schools eliminated.

TABLE 34

Frequencies and Percentages for Office Education Coordinators on Objectives*

Objective	Value Assigned		
	Great Value	Some Value	No Value
Improve student motivation in class	16 (36%)	26 (59%)	2 (5%)
Improve student motivation on the job	6 (14%)	30 (68%)	8 (18%)
Improve employers' interest in the program	9 (21%)	27 (61%)	8 (18%)
Improve school administrators' interest	16 (36%)	21 (48%)	7 (16%)
Develop student leadership ability	36 (82%)	8 (18%)	
Develop student social maturity	25 (57%)	19 (43%)	
Aid vocational understanding	9 (20%)	32 (73%)	3 (7%)
Aid in awareness of career options	4 (9%)	35 (80%)	5 (11%)
Receive news of latest developments in chosen career	2 (5%)	28 (65%)	13 (30%)
Have personal contact with leaders in profession	13 (31%)	25 (60%)	4 (9%)
Participate in State and National Contests (competitive events)	27 (61%)	15 (34%)	2 (5%)
Develop occupational competencies	9 (20%)	29 (66%)	6 (14%)
Acquire prestige and recognition	18 (41%)	25 (57%)	1 (2%)
Develop skill in competition	14 (32%)	30 (68%)	
Develop awareness of ethical business practices	7 (16%)	32 (73%)	5 (11%)
Develop civic consciousness (citizenship)	18 (41%)	24 (55%)	2 (4%)
Develop respect for education	9 (20%)	30 (68%)	5 (11%)
Develop economic appreciation	9 (21%)	28 (65%)	6 (14%)
Enrich and complement instruction	14 (32%)	29 (66%)	1 (2%)

*Evaluations are reported for all responding coordinators. Participation is reported by school, with duplicate schools eliminated.

TABLE 35

Frequencies and Percentages for Office Education Coordinators on Activities*

Activity	Value Assigned			
	Great Value	Some Value	No Value	Participated
State leadership conferences	22 (50%)	21 (48%)	1 (2%)	32 (80%)
National leadership conferences	13 (32%)	25 (61%)	3 (7%)	19 (48%)
Sales projects (e.g. cookie sales)	3 (7%)	35 (80%)	6 (14%)	34 (85%)
Fund raising through participation in local business community activity (e.g. display or office services)	4 (10%)	32 (80%)	4 (10%)	15 (38%)
Fund raising through participation in school community activity (e.g. school store or typing service)	2 (5%)	32 (78%)	7 (17%)	18 (45%)
Individual competitive events at leadership conference	19 (43%)	24 (55%)	1 (2%)	33 (82%)
Chapter competitive events at leadership conference	16 (37%)	24 (56%)	3 (7%)	19 (48%)
Career workshops or clinics	17 (39%)	25 (57%)	2 (4%)	16 (40%)
Employer-employee banquet/luncheons/ breakfasts	30 (68%)	12 (27%)	2 (5%)	35 (88%)
Civic involvement (e.g. clothing for the needy)	19 (45%)	22 (53%)	1 (2%)	23 (58%)
Leadership training seminar (e.g. Student Council training)	14 (34%)	23 (56%)	4 (10%)	8 (20%)
Schoolwide auditorium programs	10 (24%)	21 (51%)	10 (24%)	6 (15%)

(Table 35 continued on the following page)

TABLE 35 (continued)

Frequencies and Percentages for Office Education Coordinators on Activities*

Activity	Value Assigned			
	Great Value	Some Value	No Value	Participated
Sponsor school dance	2 (5%)	25 (60%)	15 (35%)	9 (22%)
News articles in school and local newspapers	25 (57%)	17 (39%)	2 (5%)	35 (88%)
Display of information and awards at school	21 (48%)	22 (50%)	1 (2%)	32 (80%)
Establishment of an occupational library	18 (42%)	21 (49%)	4 (9%)	10 (25%)
Open house for parents, employers, faculty	22 (51%)	17 (40%)	4 (9%)	21 (52%)
Regular vocational youth organization meetings	18 (41%)	25 (57%)	1 (2%)	30 (75%)
Preparation of a vocational youth organization handbook	7 (16%)	34 (79%)	2 (5%)	13 (32%)
Joint meetings with other organizations	10 (23%)	28 (65%)	5 (12%)	18 (45%)
Classroom speakers	21 (48%)	23 (52%)		37 (92%)
Speakers for meetings outside of class	13 (30%)	22 (51%)	8 (19%)	9 (22%)
Social/cultural development (e.g. dinners, theater, teas, etc.)	19 (44%)	21 (49%)	3 (7%)	24 (60%)
Formal leadership training	19 (44%)	21 (49%)	3 (7%)	7 (18%)

*Evaluations are reported for all responding coordinators. Participation is reported by school, with duplicate schools eliminated.

TABLE 36

Frequencies and Percentages for Distributive Education Coordinators on Objectives*

Objective	Value Assigned		
	Great Value	Some Value	No Value
Improve student motivation in class	35 (42%)	46 (55%)	3 (3%)
Improve student motivation on the job	19 (23%)	53 (63%)	12 (14%)
Improve employers' interest in the program	28 (34%)	50 (60%)	5 (6%)
Improve school administrators' interest	30 (37%)	46 (56%)	6 (7%)
Develop student leadership ability	60 (72%)	23 (28%)	
Develop student social maturity	43 (52%)	40 (48%)	
Aid vocational understanding	18 (22%)	53 (63%)	12 (14%)
Aid in awareness of career options	13 (16%)	63 (76%)	7 (8%)
Receive news of latest developments in chosen career	5 (6%)	49 (60%)	28 (34%)
Have personal contact with leaders in profession	26 (31%)	48 (58%)	9 (11%)
Participate in State and National Contests (competitive events)	58 (71%)	20 (24%)	4 (5%)
Develop occupational competencies	14 (17%)	62 (75%)	7 (8%)
Acquire prestige and recognition	35 (42%)	43 (52%)	5 (6%)
Develop skill in competition	42 (51%)	35 (42%)	6 (7%)
Develop awareness of ethical business practices	14 (17%)	53 (64%)	16 (19%)
Develop civic consciousness (citizenship)	27 (33%)	49 (59%)	7 (8%)
Develop respect for education	13 (16%)	56 (67%)	14 (17%)
Develop economic appreciation	13 (16%)	55 (69%)	12 (15%)
Enrich and complement instruction	28 (34%)	51 (61%)	4 (5%)

*Evaluations are reported for all responding coordinators. Participation is reported by school, with duplicate schools eliminated.

TABLE 37

Frequencies and Percentages for Distributive Education Coordinators on Activities*

Activity	Value Assigned			
	Great Value	Some Value	No Value	Participated
State leadership conferences	56 (69%)	24 (30%)	1 (1%)	64 (86%)
National leadership conferences	34 (44%)	40 (51%)	4 (5%)	33 (45%)
Sales projects (e.g. cookie sales)	30 (37%)	44 (54%)	7 (9%)	60 (81%)
Fund raising through participation in local business community activity (e.g. display or office services)	22 (27%)	50 (62%)	9 (11%)	21 (28%)
Fund raising through paritcipation in school community activity (e.g. school store or typing service)	35 (43%)	41 (50%)	6 (7%)	41 (55%)
Individual competitive events at leadership conference	51 (62%)	29 (35%)	2 (2%)	59 (80%)
Chapter competitive events at leadership conference	27 (33%)	47 (57%)	8 (10%)	29 (39%)
Career workshops or clinics	27 (33%)	42 (52%)	12 (15%)	45 (61%)
Employer-employee banquet/luncheons/ breakfasts	48 (58%)	32 (39%)	3 (4%)	62 (84%)
Civic involvement (e.g. clothing for the needy)	28 (34%)	46 (55%)	9 (11%)	36 (49%)
Leadership training seminar (e.g. Student Council training)	19 (25%)	49 (64%)	9 (12%)	20 (27%)
Schoolwide auditorium programs	3 (4%)	60 (75%)	17 (21%)	9 (12%)

(Table 37 continued on the following page)

TABLE 37 (continued)

Frequencies and Percentages for Distributive Education Coordinators on Activities*

Activity	Value Assigned			
	Great Value	Some Value	No Value	Participated
Sponsor school dance	4 (5%)	48 (59%)	30 (37%)	19 (26%)
News articles in school and local newspapers	43 (52%)	39 (47%)	1 (1%)	69 (93%)
Display of information and awards in school	33 (40%)	45 (54%)	5 (6%)	51 (69%)
Establish an occupational library	28 (34%)	52 (63%)	3 (3%)	26 (35%)
Open house for parents, employers, faculty	33 (41%)	43 (53%)	5 (6%)	36 (49%)
Regular vocational youth organization meetings	31 (39%)	46 (57%)	3 (4%)	53 (72%)
Preparation of a vocational youth organization handbook	20 (24%)	52 (64%)	10 (12%)	12 (16%)
Joint meetings with other organizations	14 (17%)	55 (67%)	13 (16%)	33 (45%)
Classroom speakers	48 (59%)	32 (39%)	2 (2%)	61 (82%)
Speakers for meetings outside of class	22 (28%)	47 (60%)	9 (12%)	26 (35%)
Social/cultural development (e.g. dinners, theater, teas, etc.)	14 (17%)	60 (74%)	7 (9%)	31 (42%)
Formal leadership training	34 (42%)	44 (54%)	3 (4%)	24 (32%)

*Evaluations are reported for all responding coordinators. Participation is reported by school, with duplicate schools eliminated.

TABLE 38

Frequencies and Percentages for Combined Programs Coordinators on Objectives*

Objective	Value Assigned		
	Great Value	Some Value	No Value
Improve student motivation in class	6 (35%)	11 (65%)	
Improve student motivation on the job	6 (35%)	10 (59%)	1 (6%)
Improve employers' interest in the program	4 (24%)	12 (71%)	1 (6%)
Improve school administrators' interest	5 (29%)	11 (65%)	1 (6%)
Develop student leadership ability	12 (71%)	5 (29%)	
Develop student social maturity	10 (59%)	7 (41%)	
Aid vocational understanding	7 (41%)	8 (47%)	2 (12%)
Aid in awareness of career options	5 (29%)	10 (59%)	2 (12%)
Receive news of latest developments in chosen career	3 (18%)	11 (64%)	3 (18%)
Have personal contact with leaders in profession	6 (35%)	10 (59%)	1 (6%)
Participate in State and National Contests (competitive events)	9 (53%)	7 (41%)	1 (6%)
Develop occupational competencies	4 (23%)	10 (59%)	3 (18%)
Acquire prestige and recognition	9 (53%)	7 (41%)	1 (6%)
Develop skill in competition	6 (35%)	11 (65%)	
Develop awareness of ethical business practices	6 (35%)	9 (53%)	2 (12%)
Develop civic consciousness (citizenship)	7 (41%)	8 (47%)	2 (12%)
Develop respect for education	3 (18%)	13 (76%)	1 (6%)
Develop economic appreciation	4 (23%)	11 (65%)	2 (12%)
Enrich and complement instruction	6 (35%)	11 (65%)	

*Evaluations are reported for all responding coordinators. Participation is reported by school, with duplicate schools eliminated.

TABLE 39

Frequencies and Percentages for Combined Programs Coordinators on Activities*

Activity	Value Assigned			
	Great Value	Some Value	No Value	Participated
State leadership conferences	10 (63%)	5 (31%)	1 (6%)	14 (82%)
National leadership conferences	6 (40%)	6 (40%)	3 (20%)	3 (18%)
Sales projects (e.g. cookie sales)	4 (23%)	10 (59%)	3 (18%)	13 (76%)
Fund raising through participation in local business community activity (e.g. display or office services)	8 (47%)	9 (53%)		6 (35%)
Fund raising through participation in school community activity (e.g. school store or typing service)	12 (75%)	4 (25%)		9 (53%)
Individual competitive events at leadership conference	11 (65%)	6 (35%)		10 (59%)
Chapter competitive events at leadership conference	8 (47%)	8 (47%)	1 (6%)	5 (29%)
Career workshops or clinics	6 (38%)	9 (56%)	1 (6%)	6 (35%)
Employer-employee banquet/luncheons/ breakfasts	10 (63%)	6 (37%)		15 (88%)
Civic involvement (e.g. clothing for the needy)	5 (33%)	8 (53%)	2 (13%)	7 (41%)
Leadership training seminar (e.g. Student Council training)	5 (31%)	9 (56%)	2 (13%)	
Schoolwide auditorium programs	1 (7%)	12 (80%)	2 (13%)	1 (6%)

(Table 39 continued for the following page)

TABLE 39 (continued)

Frequencies and Percentages for Combined Programs Coordinators on Activities*

Activity	Value Assigned			
	Great Value	Some Value	No Value	Participated
Sponsor school dance	1 (7%)	10 (67%)	4 (26%)	5 (29%)
News articles in school and local newspapers	8 (47%)	9 (53%)		15 (88%)
Display of information and awards in school	6 (35%)	9 (53%)	2 (12%)	9 (53%)
Establish an occupational library	5 (31%)	9 (56%)	2 (13%)	3 (18%)
Open house for parents, employers faculty	7 (44%)	9 (56%)		3 (18%)
Regular vocational youth organization meetings	7 (41%)	10 (59%)		12 (71%)
Preparation of a vocational youth organization handbook	4 (25%)	11 (69%)	1 (6%)	2 (12%)
Joint meetings with other organizations	5 (36%)	9 (64%)		3 (18%)
Classroom speakers	9 (53%)	8 (47%)		12 (71%)
Speakers for meetings outside of class	7 (44%)	8 (50%)	1 (6%)	4 (24%)
Social/cultural development (e.g. dinners, theater, teas, etc.)	8 (53%)	7 (47%)		9 (53%)
Formal leadership training	7 (44%)	9 (56%)		2 (12%)

*Evaluations are reported for all responding coordinators. Participation is reported by school, with duplicate schools eliminated.

TABLE 40

Chi Square Values Computed Based on Five Stratification Categories

Item	Age[1]		Sex		No. of Yrs. Tchg. Experience[2]		Program Area[3]		Enrollment in School[4]	
	X^2	df	X^2	df	X^2	df	X^2	df	X^2	df
Required Membership:										
local	.6	2	.1	1	.2	2	1.4	2	6.0*	2
state	2.6	2	.3	1	.4	2	3.9	2	3.9	2
national	2.2	2	.0	1	.2	2	2.3	2	2.8	2
Membership should be required:										
local	2.0	2	.3	1	.6	2	1.7	2	3.6	2
state	2.9	2	.9	1	.0	2	1.0	2	.4	2
national	1.7	2	.9	1	.0	2	1.4	2	.0	2
Classroom time used	4.1	6	1.4	3	6.6	6	3.2	6	5.7	6
Classroom time should be used	4.0	6	.9	3	10.5	6	2.5	6	6.2	6
Percent of grade ("1s")	7.8	8	2.6	4	10.5	8	6.1	8	3.9	8
Percent of grade ("should be")	9.6	8	3.8	4	12.4	8	6.0	8	9.7	8
Available to non-coop students	1.4	2	1.9	1	1.5	2	1.2	2	1.0	2
Available to non-seniors	5.5	6	5.7	3	8.7	6	14.7**	6	9.6	6

(continued on the following page)

TABLE 40 (continued)

Chi Square Values Computed Based on Five Stratification Categories

Item	Age[1]		Sex		No. of Yrs. Tchg. Experience[2]		Program Area[3]		Enrollment in School[4]	
	X^2	df	X^2	df	X^2	df	X^2	df	X^2	df
Role of the coordinator	10.7	8	1.6	4	17.1*	8	17.5*	8	8.1	8
Adequately prepared?	.2	2	2.7	1	5.9	2	1.6	2	4.7	2
Value of the following as objectives:										
Improve student motivation in class	1.7	4	.4	2	4.5	4	1.3	4	4.5	4
Improve student motivation on the job	4.7	4	4.9	2	4.0	4	4.3	4	1.7	4
Improve employers' interest in the program	3.2	4	2.6	2	1.3	4	6.9	4	1.1	4
Improve school administrators' interest	5.1	4	6.1*	2	4.0	4	3.4	4	14.9**	4
Develop student leadership ability	8.5	4	.2	2	8.8	4	1.6	4	1.2	4
Develop student social maturity	.2	4	.6	2	2.6	4	.5	4	.8	4
Aid vocational understanding	1.8	4	5.5	2	1.3	4	5.2	4	2.0	4

(continued on the following page)

TABLE 40 (continued)

Chi Square Values Computed Based on Five Stratification Categories

Item	Age[1]		Sex		No. of Yrs. Tchg. Experience[2]		Program Area[3]		Enrollment in School[4]	
	X^2	df	X^2	df	X^2	df	X^2	df	X^2	df
Aid in awareness of career options	1.1	4	6.1*	2	2.7	4	4.4	4	.2	4
Receive news of latest developments in chosen career	2.3	4	2.5	2	1.8	4	4.6	4	9.7*	4
Have personal contact with leaders in profession	11.7*	4	2.8	2	5.9	4	.5	4	7.2	4
Participate in State and National contests (competitive events)	8.2	4	1.4	2	13.8**	4	2.7	4	7.3	4
Develop occupational competencies	6.6	4	3.2	2	1.4	4	2.5	4	2.3	4
Acquire prestige and recognition	3.0	4	1.3	2	3.8	4	1.9	4	6.1	4
Develop skill in competition	5.7	4	2.5	2	4.5	4	11.2*	4	6.4	4
Develop awareness of ethical business practices	3.7	4	1.6	2	1.4	4	5.0	4	2.1	4
Develop civic consciousness (citizenship)	3.4	4	2.0	2	4.1	4	2.1	4	5.0	4
Develop respect for education	2.8	4	.7	2	1.7	4	2.1	4	7.0	4

(continued on the following page)

TABLE 40 (continued)

Chi Square Values Computed Based on Five Stratification Categories

Item	Age[1]		Sex		No. of Yrs. Tchg. Experience[2]		Program Area[3]		Enrollment in School[4]	
	X^2	df	X^2	df	X^2	df	X^2	df	X^2	df
Develop economic appreciation	7.4	4	.5	2	3.7	4	.8	4	3.4	4
Enrich and complement instruction	2.7	4	1.0	2	1.5	4	1.4	4	1.0	4
Value of the following as activities:										
State leadership conferences	16.1**	4	3.4	2	13.6**	4	6.0	4	3.9	4
National leadership conferences	10.3*	4	.3	2	7.8	4	5.7	4	2.6	4
Sales projects (e.g. cookie sales)	9.5*	4	2.7	2	10.0*	4	14.3**	4	2.3	4
Fund raising through participation in local business community activity (e.g. display or office services)	10.5*	4	3.4	2	9.2	4	10.9*	4	10.7*	4
Fund raising through participation in school community activity (e.g. school school store or typing service)	14.2**	4	3.0	2	12.7*	4	30.6**	4	8.2	4

(continued on the following page)

TABLE 40 (continued)

Chi Square Values Computed Based on Five Stratification Categories

Item	Age[1]		Sex		No. of Yrs. Tchg. Experience[2]		Program Area[3]		Enrollment in School[4]	
	X^2	df	X^2	df	X^2	df	X^2	df	X^2	df
Individual competitive events at leadership conference	9.0	4	.9	2	8.0	4	5.2	4	1.4	4
Chapter competitive events at leadership conference	5.8	4	.1	2	3.3	4	1.5	4	1.6	4
Career workshops or clinics	8.9	4	3.4	2	4.6	4	3.5	4	2.8	
Employer-employee banquet/ luncheons/breakfasts	12.2*	4	3.8	2	9.9*	4	2.3	4	7.1	4
Civic involvement (e.g. clothing for the needy)	5.3	4	3.4	2	3.5	4	3.9	4	3.8	4
Leadership training seminar (e.g. Student Council training)	4.2	4	.1	2	2.7	4	1.3	4	5.5	4
Schoolwide auditorium programs	2.7	4	6.2*	2	4.4	4	14.6**	4	2.8	4
School dance sponsorship	9.5*	4	1.8	2	5.4	4	.6	4	3.7	4
News articles in school and local newspapers	2.6	4	.5	2	3.3	4	2.9	4	3.2	4
Display of information and awards at school	.8	4	2.4	2	1.4	4	2.8	4	6.3	4

(continued on the following page)

TABLE 40 (continued)

Chi Square Values Computed Based on Five Stratification Categories

Item	Age[1]		Sex		No. of Yrs. Tchg. Experience[2]		Program Area[3]		Enrollment in School[4]	
	X^2	df	X^2	df	X^2	df	X^2	df	X^2	df
Establishment of an occupational library	9.3	4	3.0	2	12.6*	4	4.1	4	7.0	4
Open house for parents, employers, faculty	6.6	4	.2	2	1.7	4	3.5	4	7.3	4
Regular vocational youth organization meetings	8.4	4	2.1	2	4.3	4	.8	4	5.6	4
Preparation of a vocational youth organization handbook	5.8	4	1.0	2	3.9	4	3.8	4	4.7	4
Joint meetings with other organizations	5.8	4	1.4	2	7.9	4	4.6	4	10.8*	4
Classroom speakers	8.2	4	.9	2	5.1	4	3.3	4	11.4*	4
Speakers for meetings outside of class time	4.5	4	1.8	2	1.6	4	3.3	4	3.8	4
Social/cultural development (e.g. dinners, theater, teas, etc.)	2.0	4	5.7	2	1.7	4	15.0**	4	5.4	4
Formal leadership training	3.6	4	1.3	2	6.5	4	1.7	4	5.5	4

(continued on the following page)

TABLE 40 (continued)

Chi Square Values Computed Based on Five Stratification Categories

Item	Age[1]		Sex		No. of Yrs. Tchg. Experience[2]		Program Area[3]		Enrollment in School[4]	
	X^2	df	X^2	df	X^2	df	X^2	df	X^2	df
Activities participated in:										
State leadership conferences	1.5	2	.8	1	2.4	2	.8	2	1.2	2
National leadership conferences	3.3	2	2.0	1	5.5	2	5.0	2	14.9**	2
Sales projects (e.g. cookie sales)	4.3	2	.7	1	8.0*	2	.3	2	2.9	2
Fund raising through participation in local business community activity (e.g. display or office services)	.7	2	.4	1	.1	2	1.1	2	.8	2
Fund raising through participation in school community activity (e.g. school store or typing service)	3.0	2	.1	1	.7	2	1.3	2	10.8**	2
Individual competitive events at leadership conference	4.3	2	.0	1	5.3	2	4.6	2	7.2*	2
Chapter competitive events at leadership conference	4.9	2	5.0*	1	5.3	2	2.1	2	5.2	2
Career workshops or clinics	1.3	2	.3	1	6.9	2	7.3*	2	5.6	2

(continued on the following page)

TABLE 40 (continued)

Chi Square Values Computed Based on Five Stratification Categories

Item	Age[1]		Sex		No. of Yrs. Tchg. Experience[2]		Program Area[3]		Enrollment in School[4]	
	X^2	df	X^2	df	X^2	df	X^2	df	X^2	df
Employer-employee banquet/ luncheons/breakfasts	1.5	2	1.0	1	.3	2	.7	2	7.3*	2
Civic involvement (e.g. clothing for the needy)	4.9	2	5.0*	1	5.3	2	2.1	2	5.2	2
Leadership training seminar (e.g. Student Council training)	2.5	2	.0	1	2.5	2	5.7	2	7.2*	2
Schoolwide auditorium programs	.3	2	.0	1	2.0	2	.9	2	2.7	2
School dance sponsorship	2.7	2	.1	1	1.5	2	.2	2	.9	2
News articles in school and local newspapers	.5	2	1.5	1	1.5	2	.5	2	3.7	2
Display of information and awards at school	.8	2	1.7	1	.6	2	4.6	2	5.0	2
Establishment of an occupational library	3.6	2	3.0	1	.8	2	2.1	2	1.9	2
Open house for parents, employers, faculty	2.9	2	1.5	1	2.1	2	6.0*	2	.9	2
Regular vocational youth organization meetings	2.7	2	.2	1	5.2	2	.2	2	4.5	2

(continued on the following page)

TABLE 40 (continued)

Chi Square Values Computed Based on Five Stratification Categories

Item	Age[1]		Sex		No. of Yrs. Tchg. Experience[2]		Program Area[3]		Enrollment in School[4]	
	X^2	df	X^2	df	X^2	df	X^2	df	X^2	df
Preparation of a vocational youth organization handbook	1.8	2	2.3	1	2.4	2	7.3*	2	1.6	2
Joint meetings with other organizations	1.0	2	.4	1	2.8	2	4.5	2	11.8**	2
Classroom speakers	.4	2	.6	1	.1	2	3.7	2	7.9*	2
Speakers for meetings outside of class time	1.9	2	.4	1	.0	2	1.9	2	2.4	2
Social/cultural development (e.g. dinners, theater, teas, etc.)	1.3	2	1.0	1	.2	2	5.5	2	2.0	2
Formal leadership training	5.4	2	.6	1	5.4	2	4.1	2	9.9**	2

[1]Stratified at 30 years and under, 31-40 years, and over 40 years.

[2]Stratified at 5 years and under, 6-14 years, and over 14 years of total teaching experience.

[3]Program areas represented are Business Education, Distributive Education, and Both.

[4]Stratified at 500 and under, 501-1000, and over 1000 in grades 10 through 12.

*$p < .05$

**$p < .01$

VOCATIONAL YOUTH ORGANIZATION (CLUB) QUESTIONNAIRE

Please provide the following information about yourself:

1. Age_____
2. Sex_____
3. Highest educational degree achieved_____
4. Major field of highest educational degree_____
5. School at which the majority of your vocational education courses were taken_____
6. Number of years of teaching experience_____
7. Number of years teaching: Cooperative Office Education_____
   Distributive Education_____
8. Number of years teaching in your present school_____
9. Program area with which you are currently associated:
   Office Education_____ Distributive Education_____ Both_____

Please provide the following information about your school:

10. Number of years the following cooperative programs have been in existence at your school: Office Education_____ Distributive Education_____
11. Total enrollment in your school grades 10 through 12_____
12. Total number of seniors in cooperative programs in:
    Office Education_____ Distributive Education_____
13. Please list the office, business, and distributive vocational youth organizations (clubs) in your school and the length of time they have existed:

    _____

    _____

14. If you do not have a club now, do you plan to start one (or more)?
    Yes_____ No_____
15. If the answer to 14 is "yes," what organization(s) do you plan to begin and when?_____
16. Indicate one of the organizations with which you are associated and, for the remaining questions of this questionnaire, refer to that organization:
    _____ Are you the advisor? Yes____ No_____
17. What extra compensation, if any, is paid to the advisor of the youth organization?_____
18. What is the yearly average income of the youth organization?_____

19. Indicate the percent of support given by each of the following:

Dues	____%
Fund-Raising	____%
School	____%
Businesses	____%
Other (List)	
_____	____%
_____	____%

20. Vocational youth organization membership: (Check all applicable blanks)

	Is Required	Should Be Required
Local	____	____
State	____	____
National	____	____

21. On the average, how much classroom time, per week, for vocational youth organization activity: (Check one in each column)

	Is Spent	Should Be Spent
None	____	____
1-3 hours	____	____
4-6 hours	____	____
More than 6 hours	____	____

22. Vocational youth organization participation, as a percent of the student's total grade: (Check one in each column)

	Is	Should Be
0%	____	____
1-10%	____	____
11-25%	____	____
26-40%	____	____
More than 40%	____	____

23. Do you think that vocational youth organization membership should be available to students who are not enrolled in a cooperative program?

Yes____ No____

24. In what grade level(s) should vocational youth organization membership be available? Seniors only_____ Juniors and Seniors_____
Sophomores, Juniors, and Seniors_____ Other_____

25. Check the category that best reflects your idea as to what the role of the coordinator in the vocational youth organization should be:

Provide leadership_____

Share leadership responsibility equally with students_____

Volunteer help when coordinator sees a need_____

Available for help only when asked_____

Other_____

_____

26. Do you feel you were adequately prepared in your teacher education program to be an advisor? Yes_____ No_____

If no, what additional preparation do you feel is needed?_____

_____

What is your opinion of the value of the vocational youth organization in achieving the following objectives?

	GREAT VALUE	SOME VALUE	NO VALUE
28. Improve student motivation in class	____	____	____
29. Improve student motivation on the job	____	____	____
30. Improve employers' interest in the program	____	____	____
31. Improve school administrators' interest	____	____	____
32. Develop student leadership ability	____	____	____
33. Develop student social maturity	____	____	____
34. Aid vocational understanding	____	____	____
35. Aid in awareness of career options	____	____	____
36. Receive news of latest developments in chosen career	____	____	____
37. Have personal contact with leaders in profession	____	____	____
38. Participate in State and National Contests (competitive events)	____	____	____
39. Develop occupational competencies	____	____	____
40. Acquire prestige and recognition	____	____	____
41. Develop skill in competition	____	____	____
42. Develop awareness of ethical business practices	____	____	____
43. Develop civic consciousness (citizenship)	____	____	____
44. Develop respect for education	____	____	____
45. Develop economic appreciation	____	____	____
46. Enrich and complement instruction	____	____	____

Indicate at the right your evaluation of the value of each activity listed.

		GREAT VALUE	SOME VALUE	NO VALUE
47.	State leadership conferences	____	____	____
48.	National leadership conferences	____	____	____
49.	Sales projects (e.g. cookie sales)	____	____	____
50.	Fund raising through participation in local business community activity (e.g. display or office services)	____	____	____
51.	Fund raising through participation in school community activity (e.g. school store or typing service)	____	____	____
52.	Individual competitive events at leadership conference	____	____	____
53.	Chapter competitive events at leadership conference	____	____	____
54.	Career workshops or clinics	____	____	____
55.	Employer-employee banquet/luncheons/breakfasts	____	____	____
56.	Civic involvement (e.g. clothing for the needy)	____	____	____
57.	Leadership training seminar (e.g. Student Council training)	____	____	____
58.	Schoolwide auditorium programs	____	____	____
59.	School dance sponsorship	____	____	____
60.	News articles in school and local newspapers	____	____	____
61.	Display of information and awards at school	____	____	____
62.	Establishment of an occupational library	____	____	____
63.	Open house for parents, employers, faculty	____	____	____
64.	Regular vocational youth organization meetings	____	____	____
65.	Preparation of a vocational youth organization handbook	____	____	____
66.	Joint meetings with other organizations	____	____	____
67.	Classroom speakers	____	____	____
68.	Speakers for meetings outside of class time	____	____	____
69.	Social/cultural development (e.g. dinners, theater, teas, etc.)	____	____	____
70.	Formal leadership training	____	____	____
71.	Other (please list):			
	_____	____	____	____
	_____	____	____	____
	_____	____	____	____

72. Now, go back through items 47-71 and circle each item in which your youth organization participated or plans to participate during the 1970-71 school year.

April 19, 1971

Office and distributive education coordinators, such as yourself, throughout Minnesota are being asked to complete the enclosed questionnaire, thus providing the opinions and attitudes about various aspects of vocational youth organizations (clubs).

In addition to providing the local coordinator with the opinions and attitudes of his colleagues throughout the State, the results of this survey will also be used in helping to develop guidelines for teacher education courses on Vocational Youth Organizations and will be examined by the state supervisors for implications to state guidelines. The report will also be made available to coordinators and school district officials for assistance in the development of local youth organizations or chapters and will be sent to the national offices of the major vocational youth organizations for possible incorporation into their national guidelines.

But in order to make this information available, we need your help in answering the questionnaire. About 15-30 minutes is all the time that will be needed, and a copy of the final report will be sent to all who return the completed questionnaire. An Addressed return envelope is enclosed for your convenience. Please return the completed questionnaire by May 7.

Yours very truly,

Gary N. McLean
Assistant Professor
Business Education
University of Minnesota

Earl Halvas
Instructor
Business Education
University of Minnesota

John Lobben
Asst. Supervisor
Distributive Education
Minnesota State Dept. of Education

This survey is being undertaken by Phi Chapter of Delta Pi Epsilon at the University of Minnesota, in cooperation with the University of Minnesota, North Hennepin Junior College, and the State Department of Education. (Delta Pi Epsilon is an honorary fraternity in business and distributive education whose main objective is to promote research in these two fields.)

Dear Coordinator:

Three weeks ago, you received a questionnaire, sponsored by Phi Chapter of Delta Pi Epsilon, on Vocatinnal Youth Organizations (Clubs).

As your completed questionnaire has not yet been returned, we are enclosing with this reminder another form. Over 70 per cent of the Office and Distribute Education coordinators in Minnesota have already returned the questionnaire. With your help, this figure can reach 100 per cent, making the information we are able to provide you later much more meaningful.

Perhaps you have raised a question similar to others we have received and would find our responses helpful. Several schools have more than one coordinator in a program. As we are interested in the attitudes of coordinators towards vocational youth organizations, we would appreciate a response from each coordinator who has received a questionnaire. Also, coordinators without vocational clubs can add a valuable dimension to our findings. We would like to determine their attitudes, as well.

Comments received suggest that the time factor was over-estimated as the questionnaire takes only 10-15 minutes to complete. Won't you take a few minutes now to answer the questions and then return the form using the stamped, addressed envelope enclosed?

Yours very truly,

Gary N. McLean
Assistant Professor
Business Education
University of Minnesota

Earl Halvas
Instructor
Business Education
University of Minnesota

John Lobben
Asst. Supervisor
Distributive Education
Minnesota State Dept.
of Education

Please fill in the information requested below. This page will be separated from the questionnaire upon receipt to insure anonymity, but the information is required to permit identification for follow-up of non-respondents.

Name _____

School Address _____

_____

_____

Return to: Professor Gary N. McLean
270 Peik Hall
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, MN 55455